arXiv:1702.04071v1 [math.GT] 14 Feb 2017

COMPARING INVARIANTS FOR MAPPING CLASSES OF SURFACES

ARTEM KOTELSKIY

Abstract. We compare two different types of mapping class invariants: Hochschild homology of A_∞ bimodule coming from bordered Heegaard Floer homology, and fixed point Floer cohomology. Having done explicit computations in the genus 2 case, we make a conjecture that the two invariants are isomorphic. We also discuss a construction of a map potentially giving the isomorphism. It comes as an open-closed map in a context of surface being viewed as 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration over $\mathbb{C}$.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Bimodule invariant coming from bordered Heegaard Floer homology 3
2.1. Pointed matched circles 3
2.2. Mapping cylinders 5
2.3. Heegaard diagrams 6
2.4. Bimodules 8
2.5. Computations 11
3. Fixed point Floer cohomology 26
3.1. Setup 26
3.2. Existing computational methods 27
4. Conjectural isomorphism 28
4.1. Statement 28
4.2. Computations 29
5. Bordered theory vs Fukaya categories 30
5.1. Auroux's construction 31
5.2. Alternative bimodule construction via Fukaya categories 32
6. Construction of a map in the double basepoint version of isomorphism 34
6.1. From one basepoint to two: bimodule 34
6.2. From one basepoint to two: fixed point Floer cohomology 36
6.3. Lefschetz fibration structure on the surface 38
6.4. Open-closed map 40
7. Appendix. Bimodules for Dehn twists on the genus two surface 41
References 47

1. Introduction

We denote by Σ_g a compact oriented genus g surface, possibly with boundary. If we want to emphasize existence of the boundary, we will write $(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g)$. Most of the time we will be working with a surface having one boundary component, and will be studying elements of a strongly based mapping class group $MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g = S^1)$, which consists of all orientation preserving self-diffeomorphisms $\phi : (\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g) \to (\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g)$ fixing the boundary, up to isotopy.

Suppose we are given a mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g = S^1)$. In sections 2 and 3 to such object we assign two homological invariants:

(1) A_∞ bimodule $N(\phi)$ (or, more precisely, its homotopy type), and its Hochschild homology $HH_*(N(\phi))$, which is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded. Bimodule $N(\phi)$ comes from bordered Heegaard Floer theory: one has to construct a Heegaard diagram for a mapping cylinder of ϕ, then consider certain intersections between α and β curves as generators, and then obtain a differential via pseudo-holomorphic curve theory. For definitions see [15], where our bimodule is also denoted by $N(\phi)$, and also the original paper [14], where the corresponding bimodule is denoted by $\widehat{CFDA}(\phi, -g+1)$. In Section 5.2 we also give an equivalent (up to homotopy equivalence) construction of this bimodule using partially wrapped Fukaya category of the surface, which will be useful in understanding the connection with the next invariant.

(2) Homology theory $HF^*(\phi)$ (suppose for a moment that ϕ is a mapping class of a closed surface) where (after picking generic representative ϕ in a mapping class) generators are non-degenerate constant sections of mapping torus (i.e. non-degenerate fixed points), and differentials are pseudo-holomorphic cylinders in mapping torus T_ϕ cross $\mathbb{R}$. Sometimes the same theory can be set up using fixed points as generators and pseudo-holomorphic discs in Lagrangian Floer cohomology of graphs of id and ϕ as differentials, but we will use the sections and cylinders approach. This invariant is called *fixed point Floer cohomology*, or *symplectic Floer cohomology*. It is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded by the sign of $det(d\phi - Id)$ at fixed points.

In order to generalize this to mapping classes fixing the boundary, one has to specify in which direction to twist the boundary slightly in order to eliminate degenerate fixed points. There are two choices (we call them + and −) for each boundary, see Figure 17 for the conventions.

In our case of a mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g = S^1 = U_1)$, we will actually consider induced mapping class $\tilde{\phi} : (\tilde{\Sigma}_g, \partial\tilde{\Sigma}_g = U_1 \cup U_2) \to (\tilde{\Sigma}_g, \partial\tilde{\Sigma}_g = U_1 \cup U_2)$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_g = \Sigma_g \backslash D^2$ is obtained by removing a disc in the small enough neighborhood of the boundary U_1, such that representative ϕ is identity on that neighborhood. And we will consider fixed point Floer cohomology $HF^*(\tilde{\phi}\,;\, U_2+, U_1-)$, which has two different perturbation twists on the two boundaries.

Based on the computations in the genus 2 case, in Section 4 we make the following

Conjecture. *Given a mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g = S^1 = U_1)$, there is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector spaces*

$$HH_*(N(\phi^{-1})) \cong HF^{*+1}(\tilde{\phi}\,;\, U_2+, U_1-)$$

This is a variation of another conjecture, which was our original motivation. Specifically, there is a conjecture that rank of Heegaard Floer homology of a fibered 3-manifold

in the second to lowest $spin^c$ structure is the same as rank of fixed point Floer cohomology of corresponding monodromy: $rk(HF^+(Y^3_\phi)) = rk(HF(\phi))$ (where ϕ is mapping class of a closed surface). See [11],[12] for verifying this in case of powers of Dehn twists. This conjecture is motivated by the fact that Heegaard Floer homology counts solutions to Seiberg-Witten equations, and in a special $spin^c$ structure its dimension reduction to a surface gives surface itself as a space of solutions (in other $spin^c$ structures solutions are points of higher symmetric products $Sym^k(\Sigma)$). So on a mapping torus Y^3_ϕ one would expect that global solutions to Seiberg-Witten equations are related to fixed points of the monodromy. In our case, instead of a mapping class of a closed surface we consider strongly based $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g = S^1 = U_1)$, and the corresponding version of fixed point Floer cohomology $HF^{*+1}(\tilde{\phi}\,;\, U_2+, U_1-)$. Instead of $HF^+(Y)$ we are considering knot Floer homology of a binding of an open book corresponding to ϕ (in the second to lowest Alexander grading), which we denote by $\widehat{HFK}(M^\circ_\phi, K\,;\, -g+1)$. It is equal to Hochschild homology $HH_*(N(\phi))$, which we actually use in this paper.

We explain where such isomorphism may come from. In Section 5 we sketch symplectic geometric interpretation of bordered Heegaard Floer homology by Denis Auroux. Then, in Section 6, we explain how our conjecture (double basepoint version of it, to be precise) can be viewed as an instance of a more general conjecture in symplectic geometry, concerning open-closed map in a context of Lefschetz fibration.

Assumptions and conventions we make:

- By ϕ we usually denote not only the diffeomorphism, but also the mapping class which it represents.
- We use convention $\omega(X_H, \cdot) = -dH$ for Hamiltonian vector fields.
- Every homological invariant we consider will be defined over the base field $\mathbb{F}_2$.
- The fixed point Floer homology we will be working with is going to be the cohomology theory, rather then homology.

Acknowledgements. I am thankful to my adviser Zoltán Szabó for his guidance and support during the project. I thank Nick Sheridan for suggesting to read one of the key references [23]. I also would like to thank Denis Auroux, Sheel Ganatra, Peter Ozsváth, Paul Seidel, András Stipsicz, Mehdi Yazdi, and Bohua Zhan for helpful conversations.

2. Bimodule invariant coming from bordered Heegaard Floer homology

Everything in this section is based on bordered Heegaard Floer homology theory. It was developed by Robert Lipshitz, Peter Ozsváth, and Dylan Thurston in [13] and [14]. We refer to those papers for the theory of A_∞ algebras, modules and bimodules, for how such objects arise in Heegaard Floer theory, and for the proofs of propositions we use along the way.

2.1. Pointed matched circles.

We will be considering surfaces with one boundary component. Moreover, it is useful to consider parameterized surfaces, i.e. surfaces with specified 1-handles. Thus let us start with the following definition.

Definition 1. A *pointed matched circle* is an oriented circle $\mathcal{Z}$, equipped with a basepoint z on it, and additional $4g$ points coming in pairs (distinct from each other and z), such that performing surgery on all $2g$ pairs results in one circle.

Construction 2.1 (surface associated to a pointed matched circle)**.** Given a pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}$, we can associate a surface, whose boundary is a circle $\mathcal{Z}$, viewing $2g$

pairs of points as feet of 1-handles. Specifically, one has to thicken $\mathcal{Z}$ into a band $\mathcal{Z} \times [0,1]$, then glue the 1-handles to $\mathcal{Z} \times \{1\}$, and then cap off the boundary component which is not the $\mathcal{Z} \times \{0\}$ (see below Figure 1 and [13, Figure 1.1]). We denote this surface by $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$, and orientation on it is induced from the boundary via the usual rule "outward normal first". Let $F(\mathcal{Z})$ denote the result of filling in disc $D_\mathcal{Z}$ to the boundary component of $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$ (so mapping classes of $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$ fixing the boundary naturally correspond to mapping classes of $F(\mathcal{Z})$ fixing the disc $D_\mathcal{Z}$). Note that any two surfaces specified by the same pointed matched circle are homeomorphic, via a homeomorphism which is uniquely determined up to isotopy.

Example 2.2. Below on the Figure 1 you can see an example of a pointed matched circle in the $g = 2$ case, and its corresponding surface of genus 2. In our computations of mapping class invariant we will be using this pointed matched circle, which we denote by $\mathcal{Z}_2$. Notice, that there are other pointed matched circles for genus 2 surface, not isomorphic to $\mathcal{Z}_2$. We could have used them. Thus here we make a particular choice, which can be understood as a choice of a parameterization of surface by specifying 0-handle (the preferred disc) and 1-handles.



FIGURE 1. An example of a pointed matched circle for $g = 2$, and its corresponding genus 2 surface.

Having a pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}$, by $-\mathcal{Z}$ we denote the same circle but with reversed orientation. The corresponding surface will also be the previous one, but with reversed orientation: $F^\circ(-\mathcal{Z}) = -F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$.

Consider now *genus g strongly based mapping class groupoid*, which is a category where objects are pointed matched circles with $4g$ points, and morphism sets are

$$MCG_0(\mathcal{Z}_L, \mathcal{Z}_R) = \{\phi : F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_L) \xrightarrow{\cong} F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_R) |\ \ \phi(z_L) = z_R\}/isotopy,$$

i.e. isotopy classes of orientation preserving diffeomorphisms respecting the boundary and the basepoint. For any pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}$ with $4g$ points the corresponding group of self-diffeomorphisms $MCG_0(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z}) \cong MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g)$ is a mapping class group of genus g surface with one boundary component.

Below on the Figure 2 there is a plan for the rest of the section. As you see, if we take $\mathcal{Z}_L = \mathcal{Z}_R$, then we will produce an invariant of a mapping class of a surface. Now we explain the different pieces of this diagram.


$MCG_0(\mathcal{Z}_L, \mathcal{Z}_R) \quad =$
$= \{\phi : F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_L) \xrightarrow{\cong} F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_R) | \phi(z_L) = z_R\}$/isotopy
1-1
Mapping cylinders up to isomorphisms
1-1
Heegaard diagrams of mapping cylinders up to isotopies, handleslides and stabilizations
A_∞ bimodules ${}^{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}_L)}N_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}_R)}$ up to homotopy equivalence

FIGURE 2. Plan for the Section 2.

2.2. **Mapping cylinders.** We need a notion of *strongly bordered 3-manifold* Y with two boundary components $\partial_1 Y$ and $\partial_2 Y$. It consists of the following data (following [14, Definition 5.1]):

(1) a preferred disc and a basepoint (on boundary of that disc) in each boundary component,
(2) parameterizations by some fixed surfaces $\psi_i : (F_i, D_i, z_i) \to \partial_i Y$ of boundaries respecting distinguished discs and basepoints,
(3) a framed arc connecting basepoints, such that framing on boundaries points inward the distinguished discs.

If we fix surfaces F_1 and F_2 by which we parameterize boundaries of Y, then there is a natural notion of an isomorphism of strongly bordered 3-manifolds — it is a diffeomorphism of corresponding three manifolds, which respects every piece of additional data, i.e. parameterizations of boundaries, arcs connecting the basepoints, and their framings.

Having strongly based mapping class we want to form a corresponding strongly bordered 3-manifold, which we call a mapping cylinder.

Construction 2.3 (mapping cylinder)**.** Fix pointed matched circles $\mathcal{Z}_L$, $\mathcal{Z}_R$ and a mapping class $\phi : (F(\mathcal{Z}_L), D_L, z_L) \to (F(\mathcal{Z}_R), D_R, z_R)$. We can form a *mapping cylinder*

$M_\phi =_\phi ([0,1] \times F(\mathcal{Z}_R))_{Id}$, which is a strongly bordered 3-manifold $Y = [0,1] \times F(\mathcal{Z}_R)$ with the following data:

(1) a parametrization of its boundary given by
$\psi_L = -\phi : -F(\mathcal{Z}_L) \to \partial_L Y = -F(\mathcal{Z}_R) = \{0\} \times -F(\mathcal{Z}_R)$ (note the twisting by ϕ)
and $\psi_R = Id : F(\mathcal{Z}_R) \to \partial_R Y = F(\mathcal{Z}_R) = \{1\} \times F(\mathcal{Z}_R)$;
(2) two distinguished discs $\{0\} \times D_R$ in $\partial_L Y$ and $\{1\} \times D_R$ in $\partial_R Y$;
(3) a framed path $\gamma_z = [0,1] \times \{z_R\}$ between $z_L \in \partial_L Y$ and $z_R \in \partial_R Y$, such that framing points inwards distinguished discs D_R at every fiber $\{t\} \times F(\mathcal{Z}_R)$. See Figure 3.



FIGURE 3. Mapping cylinder of $\phi : (F(\mathcal{Z}_L), D_L, z_L) \to (F(\mathcal{Z}_R), D_R, z_R)$.

The following lemma, proof of which can be found in [14, Lemma 5.29], allows us to talk about mapping cylinders instead of mapping classes (and vice versa), i.e. explains the first correspondence on the Figure 2.

Lemma 2.4. *Fix pointed matched circles $\mathcal{Z}_L$ and $\mathcal{Z}_R$. Then any strongly bordered 3-manifold Y, whose boundary is parameterized by $F(\mathcal{Z}_L)$ and $F(\mathcal{Z}_R)$, and whose underlying space can be identified with a product of a surface with an interval (so that arc γ_z is identified with the product of a point with the interval, respecting the framing) is of the form M_ϕ for some choice of strongly based mapping class $\phi : F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_L) \to F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_R)$. Moreover, two such strongly bordered three-manifolds are isomorphic if and only if they represent the same strongly based mapping class.*

2.3. **Heegaard diagrams.** Now, having constructed mapping cylinder M_ϕ, we would like to have a 2-dimensional presentation of it.

Definition 2. An *arced bordered Heegaard diagram with two boundary components* is a quadruple $(\overline{\Sigma}, \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{z})$ where

- $\overline{\Sigma}_g$ is an oriented compact surface of genus g with two boundary components, $\partial_L \overline{\Sigma}$ and $\partial_R \overline{\Sigma}$;
- $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \{\overline{\alpha}_1^{arc,left}, \dots, \overline{\alpha}_{2l}^{arc,left}, \overline{\alpha}_1^{arc,right}, \dots, \overline{\alpha}_{2r}^{arc,right}, \dots, \alpha_1^{curve}, \dots, \alpha_{g-l-r}^{curve}\}$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint $2l$ embedded arcs with boundaries on $\partial_L \overline{\Sigma}$, $2r$ embedded

arcs with boundaries on $\partial_R\overline{\Sigma}$, and $g-l-r$ circles in the interior (in particular $g \geqslant l+r$);
- $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \{\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_g\}$ is a g-tuple of pairwise disjoint curves in the interior of $\overline{\Sigma}$;
- $\boldsymbol{z}$ is a path in $\overline{\Sigma} \setminus (\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cup \boldsymbol{\beta})$ between $\partial_L\overline{\Sigma}$ and $\partial_R\overline{\Sigma}$;

These are required to satisfy:

- $\overline{\Sigma} \setminus \overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $\overline{\Sigma} \setminus \boldsymbol{\beta}$ are connected;
- $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ intersects $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ transversely.



FIGURE 4. Heegaard diagram for M_{id}, where $id : F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \to F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ is the identity mapping class of genus 2 surface. The pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}_2$ is the one from Figure 1. We also indicate here orientations of the α and β curves, because later they will give $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading on Hochschild homology.

Notice that two boundaries of any Heegaard diagram specify two pointed matched circles. On Figure 4 you can see an example of a Heegaard diagram of a mapping cylinder of $id : \Sigma_2 \to \Sigma_2$.

The following proposition provides the second correspondence on the Figure 2.

Proposition 2.5. *Any arced bordered Heegaard diagram with two boundary components gives rise to a strongly bordered 3-manifold. For the other direction, suppose a strongly bordered 3-manifold has a boundary parameterized by $F(\mathcal{Z}_1)$ and $F(\mathcal{Z}_2)$. Then this 3-manifold has an arced bordered Heegaard diagram, boundary pointed matched circles of which are $\mathcal{Z}_1$ and $\mathcal{Z}_2$. Diffeomorphism type of this Heegaard diagram is unique up to the following moves:*

- *Isotopies of α- and β- curves and arcs;*
- *Handleslides among the α-circles and among the β-circles;*
- *Handleslides of an α-arc over an α-circle;*
- *Stabilization of the diagram.*

Procedure of getting a strongly bordered three manifold consists of thickening the surface, attaching 2-handle along circles (along β-circles from one side, and along α-circles from the other side), and then carefully analyzing what happens on the α side of the boundary. There one has two surfaces of genus l and r with parameterizations coming from the Heegaard diagram, which are connected by an annulus, along which there is the path $\boldsymbol{z}$. This annulus, along with the path $\boldsymbol{z}$ on it, specify the framed arc γ_z by which the two boundary surfaces are connected in the definition of a strongly bordered 3-manifold. Existence of Heegaard diagram (and uniqueness up to the set of moves) follows from Morse theory. See [13, Proposition 4.10] for the proof.

2.4. **Bimodules.** The invariant which we are going to investigate was defined in [14] and then subsequently studied in [15]. We follow notation of the latter paper for the algebra and bimodule. Here we give a classical definition of the bimodule from the original paper [14], whereas in [15] authors took another approach, which is similar in spirit to definition we give in Section 5.2. See also [24] for the combinatorial geometric proof of correctness of bimodule definition from [15].

First, we need to specify the algebra.

Construction 2.6 (dg-algebra associated to a pointed matched circle)**.** To a pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}$ one can associate a *dg*-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$, which is $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, -g+1)$ in the notation of [14] (i.e. we have only one-strand-moving). Below on the Figure 5 there is an example of such an algebra in the genus 2 case. First, having pointed matched circle, we construct a directed graph. Vertices of that graph are pairs of points from the pointed matched circle, and edges are the short chords between the points, which do not cross basepoint z. To this directed graph (quiver for short) we associate a path algebra. The generators of the underlying $\mathbb{F}_2$-vector space are all the paths of the quiver (including constant paths). We use the following notations for paths: $\rho_{j_1} \dots \rho_{j_k} = \rho_{j_1 \dots j_k}$. Multiplication in the algebra is given by concatenating paths, if possible (for example $\iota_1 \cdot \rho_4 \cdot \rho_5 = \rho_{45}$). If impossible, we declare the product to be 0. Then we quotient this algebra by saying that some valid paths are also 0. Those are the paths where you concatenate chords which are not consecutive on the pointed matched circle, w.r.t. its orientation. For example despite of the fact that ρ_{32} is a valid path, we don't consider because ρ_2 does not go right after ρ_3, and thus $\rho_{32} = 0$. Notice that this affects multiplication also, because now $\rho_3 \cdot \rho_2 = \rho_{32} = 0$. Differential in *dg*-algebras $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$ will always be trivial. All the constant paths are idempotents in the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$, and they correspond to pairs of points in pointed matched circle, i.e. 1-handles of $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$. In our genus 2 case we denote idempotents by i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3. Sum of all idempotents gives a unit.

Now we turn to the construction of a bimodule.



FIGURE 5. Genus 2 example of how you get a *dg*-algebra from a pointed matched circle.

Construction 2.7 (A_∞ bimodule associated to a mapping class)**.** Fix a surface with one boundary component $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma = S^1) = F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$. Mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) = MCG_0(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ gives rise to a strongly bordered 3-manifold M_ϕ, the mapping cylinder of ϕ. After this we can consider a corresponding Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_\phi)$, with pointed matched circles $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ on the boundaries. To such Heegaard diagram one can associate an A_∞ bimodule ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ of DA type, over the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$ from both sides.

Generators of the underlying $\mathbb{F}_2$-vector space of the bimodule consist of tuples $\mathbf{x}$ of intersections between α- and β- curves, such that every α and β circle gets 1 point, only one α-arc on the right boundary gets 1 point (others get 0; denote this α-arc by $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}^{arc,right}$), and all except one α-arc on the left boundary get 1 point (denote this α-arc by $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}^{arc,left}$). See an example on Figure 11, where we marked all the generators on a Heegaard diagram.

Idempotent subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$ acts on these generators in the following way. By Construction 2.6 for an α-arc there is an associated idempotent of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$, which we denote by $i(\alpha^{arc})$. For a generator $\mathbf{x}$, we have actions $i(\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}^{arc,left}) \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x} \cdot i(\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}^{arc,right}) = \mathbf{x}$, and other idempotent actions are zero.

Other A_∞ actions on these generators are defined using counting of pseudo-holomorphic curves. Along the way of the definition, one has to make an analytic choice of a family of almost complex structures on some space. If one makes a different analytic choice, or chooses a different Heegaard diagram for M_ϕ, the resulting bimodule will be the same up to homotopy equivalence. For definitions and the proof of invariance see [14, Section 6.3] and references there. For the theory of A_∞ algebras, modules, and bimodules see [13, Section 2] and [14, Section 2].

This finishes the explanation of how to a mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) = MCG_0(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ one can associate a homotopy type of bimodules ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$. Along the way one needs to make a choice of a particular pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}$, and identification of $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$ and $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$. It turns out that for us this choice is not important. Mapping class groups with different parameterizations of the surface $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \cong_1 F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$ and $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \cong_2 F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}')$ (note that if pointed matched circles are equal, it does not mean that identifications are the same) can be bijectively identified via conjugation by some element $a \in MCG_0(F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}), F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}'))$. Conveniently, the bimodules are also related: $N(\phi) \simeq N(a^{-1}) \boxtimes N(\psi) \boxtimes N(a)$ for $\phi = a\psi a^{-1} \in MCG_0(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ and $\psi \in MCG_0(\mathcal{Z}', \mathcal{Z}')$, see next paragraph for the explanation of this formula. Moreover, the main invariant for us is going to be the Hochschild homology of a bimodule, and it is invariant w.r.t. conjugation of a mapping class.

An important feature of this mapping class invariant is that there is an operation which corresponds to a multiplication in a mapping class group. Namely, if we have a mapping class $\phi = \phi_1 \circ \phi_2 = \phi_1\phi_2$, then $M_{\phi_1\phi_2} \cong M_{\phi_2\partial_R} \cup_{\partial_L} M_{\phi_1}$, and for Heegaard diagrams also $\mathcal{H}_{\phi_1\phi_2} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\phi_2\partial_R} \cup_{\partial_L} \mathcal{H}_{\phi_1}$. For the bimodules the corresponding operation is A_∞ tensor product, and we have the following homotopy equivalence of bimodules:

$$ {}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(\phi_1\phi_2)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} N(\phi_2)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} N(\phi_1)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \tag{2.1}$$

It follows from a pairing theorem, see [14, Theorem 12]. For the relevant definition of box tensor product see [14, Section 2.3.2]. Box tensor product is a model for A_∞ tensor product in the case when you pair D side to the A side, see [13, Sections 2.2,2.4] for the explanation of that.

2.4.1. *Other types of bimodules.* Our algebra is a direct summand of a bigger algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}) = \bigoplus_{-g \leqslant k \leqslant g} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, k)$, namely $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, -g+1)$. See [13, Section 3] for the definition of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z})$. Denote the algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, g-1)$ by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!$. It is Koszul to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$, and in general we have Koszul duality $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, -l)^! = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, l)$, see [17, Section 8] for that.

To a Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_\phi)$ one can associate not only DA type A_∞ bimodule ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} = {}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\widehat{CFDA}(\phi, -g+1)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ (we will be dropping the index $-g+1$ later for this bimodule), but also DD and AA type bimodules ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\widehat{CFDD}(\phi)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}$ and ${}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}\widehat{CFAA}(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ (note the changes of the algebra to its Koszul dual), see [14, Section 6] for the definitions. The sets of generators for these three bimodules are the same, but A_∞ actions are different. Note, that all these three bimodules are direct summands of more general ones over the algebras $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z})^! = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z})$. These summands are characterized by the number of arcs generators occupy on the left and right side of a Heegaard diagram — for us it is 2g-1 on the left, and 1 on the right. Equivalently, one can say that these generators are in such *spin*^{c} structures of M_ϕ, that its Chern class evaluates $-2g+2$ on the boundary surfaces of $M(\phi)$.

2.4.2. *Hochschild homology.* In order to relate a bimodule $N(\phi)$ to fixed point Floer cohomology, one needs to apply an algebraic operation to the bimodule, which is called Hochschild homology. It is a homology theory for A_∞ bimodules over the same algebra from both sides, which is obtained by a self-tensoring procedure. We refer to [14, Section 2.3.5] for algebraic definitions, basic properties, and a way to compute Hochschild homology for bounded DA type bimodules.

There are two important points about this algebraic structure. First, Hochschild homology depends only on homotopy type of a bimodule. Thus, taking $HH_*({}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})})$ would

give us an invariant of a mapping class. Second, $HH_*({}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})})$ is in fact naturally identified with a knot Floer homology of binding of an open book M°_ϕ with a monodromy $\phi : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \to (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$:

$$HH_*(N(\phi)) \cong \widehat{HFK}(M^\circ_\phi, K\,;\ -g+1)$$

Following [14, Section 5], this open book is obtained from M_ϕ by identifying two boundaries (thus the path γ_z becomes a circle) and then doing surgery on γ_z with respect to the framing we had in the construction 2.3 of M_ϕ.

The construction of a Heegaard diagram for this open book goes as follows. First take an arced bordered Heegaard diagram for mapping cylinder $\mathcal{H}(M_\phi)$, and glue left boundary to the right (on algebraic level, this corresponds to self-tensoring the bimodule). Then do a surgery on arc $\boldsymbol{z}$ (which became a circle after self-gluing). Note, that in order to block those discs which we didn't count, one needs to place two basepoints on the two sides after surgery — these two basepoints specify a knot, which is the binding of an open book.

Up to the self-pairing procedure, this explains why $\widehat{HFK}(M^\circ_\phi, K;\ -g+1) \cong HH_*(N(\phi))$, see [14, Theorem 14] for the details. Because we work in the second to lowest $spin^c$ structure, we only get the Alexander grading $-g+1$.

Remark. This implies that $HH_*(N(\phi))$ is invariant w.r.t. conjugation of ϕ.

Using this interpretation of Hochschild homology, we can endow it with a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading — it corresponds to the sign of intersection of tori $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ and $\mathbb{T}_\beta$ in the definition of generators of knot Floer homology. Because Heegaard diagram for an open book is constructed via self-gluing, $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading, i.e. choice of orientations on $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$, $\mathbb{T}_\beta$, amounts to the choice of orientations on β and α curves on the diagram for M_ϕ (s.t. they are consistent, i.e. after gluing left arcs orientations match with the right arcs orientations). Let us choose these orientations as on the Figure 4. To obtain a consistent $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading on $HH_*(N(\phi))$ in general case for $\phi : MCG_0(\Sigma_g, \partial\Sigma_g)$, one needs to make such choices of orientations on standard Heegaard diagram for M_ϕ (see [14, Section 5.3] or the next subsection 2.5 for a construction of standard $\mathcal{H}(M_\phi)$), that gradings of all $2g$ generators of $HH_*(N(id))$ are zero.

2.4.3. *Cancellation.* Let us finish this section by describing what is a cancellation. Suppose there are two generators in a DA bimodule P satisfying $d(x) = y$, i.e. there is only one action from x to y, and it does not have any incoming or outgoing algebra elements (an example of such two generators is x_2 and t_{12} on Figure 14). Then one can cancel these two generators, i.e. erase x and y and the arrows involving them from the bimodule, and then add some other arrows between the generators left in the bimodule, guided by a certain cancellation rule. The outcome is a bimodule P' with less generators, but which is homotopy equivalent to the previous one, $P' \simeq P$. See [27, Section 3.1] for the details of how cancellation works.

2.5. **Computations.** In this section we compute bimodules for mapping classes of genus 2 surface. Genus 1 case was computed in [14, Section 10]. At the end we also describe an algorithm for computing Hochschild homology.

First, fix a set of curves on genus 2 surface Σ_2 with 1 boundary component, as on the Figure 6.

There is (see [5]) a following presentation of the mapping class group of genus 2 surface with one boundary component:

$$MCG_0(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2) =< \tau_A, \tau_B, \tau_C, \tau_D, \tau_E |\ \ commuting\ relations,\ \ braid\ relations >,$$



FIGURE 6. Dehn twists along these curves generate $MCG_0(\Sigma_2)$.

where τ_l is a right handed Dehn twist around the curve l. Commuting relation means two Dehn twists τ_{l_1} and τ_{l_2} commute if l_1 and l_2 do not intersect, and braid relation means that if l_1 and l_2 intersect at a single point transversely, then $\tau_{l_2}\tau_{l_1}\tau_{l_2} = \tau_{l_1}\tau_{l_2}\tau_{l_1}$.

Now we explain how to compute the bimodule invariant for a mapping class of genus 2 surface. Every mapping class can be represented by the product of Dehn twists $\tau_A, \tau_B, \tau_C, \tau_D, \tau_E$ and their inverses. We also know how bimodule invariants behave with respect to composition of mapping classes, the corresponding operation is box tensor product. Thus it is enough to compute the bimodule $N(\phi)$ only for these Dehn twists and their inverses (10 bimodules in total).

Remark. Notice, that after this computation is done, one can redefine bimodule invariant for ϕ in a combinatorial way. Namely, for a factorization of ϕ into Dehn twists above, lets say it is $\phi = \tau_A\tau_C\tau_E^{-1}$, one associates a tensor product of corresponding bimodules $N(\tau_E^{-1})\boxtimes N(\tau_C)\boxtimes N(\tau_A)$. To make sure this definition is correct, one needs to check mapping class group relations. For example for a relation $\tau_A\tau_B\tau_A = \tau_B\tau_A\tau_B$ one needs to check the following homotopy equivalence $N(\tau_A)\boxtimes N(\tau_B)\boxtimes N(\tau_A) \simeq N(\tau_B)\boxtimes N(\tau_A)\boxtimes N(\tau_B)$. After we wrote down the 10 bimodules, we checked the relations using computer program [28], and indeed they are satisfied (homotopy equivalence actually always came as an isomorphism of bimodules after all possible cancellations were made).

This is a good strategy to assign Floer theoretic invariants to topological objects without referring to pseudo-holomorphic theory. See paper of Bohua Zhan [27] for a combinatorial definition of $\widehat{CFDA}(\phi, 0)$ (it is analogue of our invariant, where generators occupy g arcs on the left and g arcs on the right boundary of a Heegaard diagram). There he uses arc-slides (as opposed to Dehn twists) as generators of mapping class groupoid. Moreover, using combinatorial definition for $\widehat{CFDA}(\phi)$, he then defines combinatorially the hat version of Heegaard Floer homology of a 3-manifold $\widehat{HF}(Y^3)$.

First we need to fix a parameterization of our surface $(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2) \cong F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2)$. This will specify a *dg*-algebra. We use the pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}_2$ and its corresponding algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ from the Figure 5. For an identification see Figure 7.

For every Dehn twist $\tau_l \in MCG_0(\Sigma_2, \Sigma_2)$ we need to specify a Heegaard diagram for a mapping cylinder M_{τ_l}. Following [14, Section 5.3], first of all, consider standard Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_{id})$ for $id : F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \to F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2)$, see Figure 8. There is a shaded region of the diagram on the right that is identified with the right boundary of mapping cylinder



FIGURE 7. Parameterization of the surface $\Sigma_2 \cong F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2)$.

$F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \setminus D^2$. Analogously there is a shaded region on the left part of the diagram which is identified with $-(F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \setminus D^2)$. There are also curves A, B, C, D and E on both of these surfaces, via the specified above identification $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \cong \Sigma_2$.

Now, suppose we want to draw a diagram for a M_{τ_E}. Then it is enough to change all the alpha arcs of the left side of $\mathcal{H}(M_{id})$ by applying τ_E. This corresponds to parameterization $-\tau_E : -F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \to \partial_L M_{\tau_E}$. So we apply right handed Dehn twist τ_{E_l} to alpha arcs. Alternatively one can apply $\tau_{E_l}^{-1}$ to all the beta curves (this corresponds to applying self-diffeomorphism $\tau_{E_l}^{-1}$ to the Heegaard diagram). We also could have applied τ_{E_r} to all alpha arcs and curves, or $\tau_{E_r}^{-1}$ to all the beta curves. All these possibilities are depicted on Figure 9. One can see that all these 4 diagrams are equivalent via equivalence moves and self-diffeomorphisms applied to the diagrams. The resulting Heegaard diagrams here are analogous to ones for genus 1 case in [14, Section 10.2].

Remark. Orientation convention (essentially sign of a Dehn twist on a diagram) is chosen so that map ϕ goes "from left to right" on the mapping cylinder and Heegaard diagram, see [17, Appendix A]. This ensures the desired behavior with respect to gluing: $\mathcal{H}_{\phi_1\phi_2} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\phi_2\partial_R} \cup_{\partial_L} \mathcal{H}_{\phi_1}$.

We will compute the bimodule $N(\tau_E)$ via second type of Heegaard diagram for τ_E, and we will compute $N(\tau_C^{-1})$ via third type of diagram for τ_C^{-1}. All other 8 bimodules can be computed analogously: for $\tau_E^{-1}, \tau_D, \tau_D^{-1}$ bimodules can be computed very similarly to τ_E case, and other five invariants for $\tau_A^{-1}, \tau_A, \tau_B^{-1}, \tau_B, \tau_C$ can be deduced from previous five by using reflection of the diagrams about x-axis. We list all ten bimodules at the end in appendix. For a general mapping class one first factorizes it into Dehn twists, and then box tensor multiplies all the bimodules for these Dehn twists.

Computation 2.8 ($N(\tau_E)$)**.** On Figure 11 we draw the Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_{\tau_E})$ along with marked generators of the bimodule, and also idempotents corresponding to 1-handles, i.e. arcs. Notice, that we reversed the orientation of the boundary on the left, because it corresponds to the D side of a bimodule, which is over $\mathcal{B}(-(-\mathcal{Z}_2)) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)$. On Figure



FIGURE 8. Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_{id})$ of identity mapping class with curves over which we do the Dehn twists.



(A) 1st type. (B) 2nd type.

(C) 3rd type. (D) 4th type.

FIGURE 9. Four Heegaard diagrams for Dehn twist along the curve E.

12 we draw the candidate DA bimodule. The subscripts of generators of DA bimodule represent the underlying left and right idempotents. The arrow between generators $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ with the label $a \otimes (b, c)$ means that there is a DA type action $\mathbf{x} \otimes (b, c) \to a \otimes \mathbf{y}$. If there is 1 in the label on the left or on the right, it means that there is no outgoing or incoming algebra elements in that action.

Let us denote for a moment our candidate bimodule by $N'(\tau_E)$, and the bimodule $N(\tau_E)$ will be the one which corresponds to the Heegaard diagram on the Figure 11. Thus we want to prove that $N'(\tau_E) \simeq N(\tau_E)$. There are two ways to do it. One is to use directly definition of A_∞ actions via pseudo-holomorphic curves. In the genus 1 case such computations were done in [14, Section 10.2], and it is possible to generalize them to compute $N(\tau_E)$. However, it is more difficult to do this for $N(\tau_C^{-1})$, which is the next computation. Thus we choose another approach, which we will also use to compute $N(\tau_C^{-1})$.

Before proceeding to the proof, let us describe the necessary background material.

Just as the behavior of DA bimodules with respect to composition of mapping classes 2.1, the following homotopy equivalences follow from the pairing theorem (we use here notation $\widehat{CFDA}(\phi)$ instead of $N(\phi)$ just to emphasize that D sides are paired with A sides) :

$$^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\widehat{CFDD}(\phi)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \widehat{CFAA}(\psi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDA}(\psi\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$$
$$^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\widehat{CFDA}(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(\psi)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(\psi\phi)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}$$

Arc-slides are generators of the mapping class groupoid, see [16, Figure 3] for a definition of arc-slide. In particular, they generate Dehn twists, and there is a standard way to decompose a Dehn twist $\tau_l : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \to (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ into a product of arc-slides. First, one should pick such a parameterization of a surface $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \cong F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$, that l is isotopic to an arc $\alpha \subset F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$, whose ends are connected along the part of the boundary which does not contain a basepoint — we denote this part by I_α. Then we consider composition of arc-slides, which slide once the points on I_α along the α, in turn. This will be the desired Dehn twist. For example, see Figure 7, there curve E is in the correct position with the arc α_E. Thus, Dehn twist τ_E is equal to a single arc-slide over that arc, which is indicated on the picture. There is also a standard Heegaard diagram for an arc-slide. In our example, this is the 3rd type of the diagram on Figure 9.

The DD type bimodules for arc-slides were computed in [16]. Let us mention that DD type bimodules are dg-bimodules (as opposed to A_∞ bimodules), and there are less moduli spaces of pseudo-holomorphic curves involved in the definition, compared to DA and AA type bimodules.

Lastly, we quote [14, Theorem 4], which says that $^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(id)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} [\mathbb{I}]_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ is *identity bimodule*, i.e. it has generators ${}_{i_k}i_{ki_k}$ for every idempotent of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$, and actions $({}_{i_k}i_{ki_k}, a) \to a \otimes_{i_l} i_{li_l}$ if we have $i_k a i_l = a$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})$ (see [14, Definition 2.2.48]). Tensoring with $^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}[\mathbb{I}]_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ does not change the homotopy type of a bimodule.

Let us return to the proof of $N'(\tau_E) \simeq N(\tau_E)$. We first prove the following homotopy equivalence (which is, in fact, isomorphism):

$$^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N'(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(id)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(\tau_E)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}.$$

All the terms are known: $N'(\tau_E)$ is our bimodule candidate, $^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\widehat{CFDD}(id)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}$ is identity DD bimodule described in [16, Section 3], and $^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\widehat{CFDD}(\tau_E)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}$ is an arc-slide DD type bimodule described in the same paper. See [16, Definition 1.7] for the criterion for checking if a bimodule is an arc-slide bimodule, and [16, Section 4] for a complete description of

arc-slide bimodules. Both sides of the homotopy equivalence above are equal to the DD bimodule 7.11, which we describe in appendix. There for elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!$ we use strand diagram notation: strands are on the horizontal lines numbered by 0 to 7, and, as an example, $|(0,\ 2),\ (1,\ 3),\ (4 \to 5)|$ means an element of the algebra corresponding to the chord from 4th to 5th line supplemented with idempotents (0, 2) and (1, 3) (this makes this an element of three-strands-moving algebra). See [13, Section 3] for a description of $B(\mathcal{Z})^!$ (and the whole $A(\mathcal{Z})$) in terms of strand diagrams.

Now, using pairing theorems, we finish the proof:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&{}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N'(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(id)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(\tau_E)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!}\\
\Rightarrow^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\ & N'(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(id)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \widehat{CFAA}(id)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDD}(\tau_E)^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})^!} \widehat{CFAA}(id)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\\
\Rightarrow^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\ & N'(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDA}(id)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDA}(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\\
\Rightarrow^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}\ & N'(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \widehat{CFDA}(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} N(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us finish this computation by describing the way we came up with the candidate bimodule $N'(\tau_E)$. Following closely [14, Section 10.2], first we spot the following actions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&x_0 \otimes \rho_1 \to \rho_1 \otimes x_1,\\
&r \to \rho_2 \otimes x_0,\\
&r \otimes \rho_3 \to x_1,\\
&x_1 \otimes \rho_4 \to \rho_4 \otimes x_2,\\
&x_2 \otimes \rho_5 \to \rho_5 \otimes x_3,\\
&x_3 \otimes \rho_6 \to \rho_6 \otimes x_3,\\
&x_2 \otimes \rho_7 \to \rho_7 \otimes x_3,\\
&x_1 \otimes \rho_2 \to \rho_{23} \otimes r,\\
&x_0 \otimes (\rho_3, \rho_2) \to \rho_3 \otimes r.
\end{aligned}
$$

All but one corresponding domains are polygons, and thus have a unique holomorphic representative. The domain for the action $x_0 \otimes (\rho_3, \rho_2) \to \rho_3 \otimes r$ has a cut from x_0 to the right boundary, and so it is an annulus with cut parameters at r going to the opposite boundaries, and so it also has a unique holomorphic representative. These are the actions which correspond to *short near-chords*, see [16, Definition 1.6] (notice that, in the notation of that paper, our Dehn twist is a degenerate underslide, and so one has to add two extra short near-chords). Then we fill out the other actions, so that A_∞ relations are satisfied (always first looking to add an action which contributes to the d^2 by factorizing the algebra element on the A-side).

Remark. In the case of arc-slide DD bimodules (see [16, Definition 1.7]), all actions in the bimodule follow from short near-chord actions, A_∞ relations, and the fact that domains which contribute actions should have Maslov index 1 (this corresponds to having an appropriate grading on the bimodule). This is not the case for the arc-slide DA bimodules. In our case above we have a degenerate underslide, and in this particular case short near-chord domains imply all other actions. However, in other cases of arc-slides (which we will need below), one should also add "by hand" one more action, which corresponds to the domain containing σ and touching both boundaries by chords of length 2, see [16, Figure 16] for the notation. On that figure this domain is $\sigma + \sigma_-$ on the left and $\sigma + \sigma_+$ on the right.

Computation 2.9 ($N(\tau_C^{-1})$)**.** On Figure 13 we draw the Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_{\tau_C^{-1}})$ along with marked generators of the bimodule. Because there are many generators, for generator t_i we only denote an intersection point on the right side of the diagram, its corresponding $2g-1=3$ intersections on the left are uniquely determined. On Figure 14 we draw the candidate DA bimodule. On some arrows (which are a little lighter on a picture) we didn't write the actions, those actions correspond to rectangles in the area with vertices t_0, t_{12} and the right edge ρ_{23456}.

Let us denote for a moment our candidate bimodule by $N'(\tau_C^{-1})$, and the bimodule $N(\tau_C^{-1})$ will be the one which corresponds to the Heegaard diagram on the Figure 13 . Thus, we want to prove that $N'(\tau_C^{-1}) \simeq N(\tau_C^{-1})$.

First, we factorize the Dehn twist τ_C^{-1} into the product of arc-slides. On Figure 7, consider a slide of the arc α_E over the arc α_A, and let us call this arc-slide η. Then you get a new parameterization of the surface, where instead of arc α_E you have an arc α'_E which is isotopic to the curve $C' \sim \eta(C)$, if one connects the ends of the arc. So the Dehn twist $\tau_{C'}^{-1}$ can be factorized into four arc-slides $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4$ along the arc α'_E, which we picture on Figure 10. Now, by a mapping class group relation $f\tau_l f^{-1} = \tau_{f(l)}$ we get the desired factorization:

$$\tau_C^{-1} = \tau^{-1}_{\eta^{-1}(C')} = \eta^{-1}\tau_{C'}^{-1}\eta = \eta^{-1}\mu_4\mu_3\mu_2\mu_1\eta.$$



FIGURE 10. Composition of these 6 arc-slides gives a left handed Dehn twist around the curve C on Figure 7, i.e. $\tau_C^{-1} = \eta^{-1}\mu_4\mu_3\mu_2\mu_1\eta$.

From this factorization we get

$$N(\eta) \boxtimes N(\mu_1) \boxtimes N(\mu_2) \boxtimes N(\mu_3) \boxtimes N(\mu_4) \boxtimes N(\eta^{-1}) \simeq N(\tau_{C'}^{-1}),$$

and so to compute $N(\tau_{C'}^{-1})$ it is left to compute the bimodules for 6 arc-slides, and then tensor them.

We computed them using exactly the same method we used in the previous computation of $N(\tau_E)$ (with the exception which is described in the remark on the previous page). We list them all at the end of the appendix.

For computing $N(\eta)\boxtimes N(\mu_1)\boxtimes N(\mu_2)\boxtimes N(\mu_3)\boxtimes N(\mu_4)\boxtimes N(\eta^{-1})$ we wrote a computer program [28]. After tensoring all 6 arc-slide bimodules, and then doing all possible cancellations, we get a bimodule, which is isomorphic to one the Figure 14 with canceled differential $x_2 \to t_{12}$. This proves the desired homotopy equivalence:

$$N'(\tau_{C'}^{-1}) \simeq N(\eta)\boxtimes N(\mu_1)\boxtimes N(\mu_2)\boxtimes N(\mu_3)\boxtimes N(\mu_4)\boxtimes N(\eta^{-1}) \simeq N(\tau_{C'}^{-1}).$$

Computation 2.10 (Hochschild homology)**.** It is the Hochschild homology of a bimodule that we are going to equate with a version of fixed point Floer cohomology. Thus we would like to have an algorithm for computing it. The method from [14, Section 2.3.5] for computing Hochschild homology for type DA bimodules works well, as long as DA bimodule is bounded (see [14, Definition 2.2.46]. All bimodules in genus 2 case, that we computed previously, are not bounded. To fix this problem, we multiply a bimodule by a certain bounded bimodule from the left and from the right, such that homotopy type does not change: ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}[\mathbb{I}]^b_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \boxtimes^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} [\mathbb{I}]^b_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} N(\phi)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$. Now we describe the construction of ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}[\mathbb{I}]^b_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$.

We know that tensoring with identity bimodule ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}N(id)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} \simeq^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})} [\mathbb{I}]_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ does not change the homotopy type. Thus it is left to make ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}[\mathbb{I}]_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z})}$ bounded, while not changing its homotopy type .

In the genus 2 case, we claim that the needed bimodule is depicted on the Figure 16, denote it by ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}[\mathbb{I}]^b_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$. The graph on that figure does not have any cycles, thus the bimodule is bounded. Canceling four differentials $c_1 \to c_2, t_1 \to t_2, z_1 \to z_2, w_1 \to w_2$ in ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}[\mathbb{I}]^b_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$ gives ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}[\mathbb{I}]_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$, so they are homotopy equivalent, and that is what we needed.

We wrote down this bimodule using the diagram on the Figure 15 (three intersections on the left side of the diagram are omitted for generators $z_1, z_2, c_1, c_2, t_1, t_2, w_1, w_2$), which is essentially Heegaard diagram from Figure 4 but with perturbed β curves so that there are no periodic domains.



FIGURE 11. Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_{\tau_E})$for the right handed Dehn twist along the curve E.


$\rho_5 \otimes \rho_5$
$+ \rho_7 \otimes \rho_7$
$+ \rho_{567} \otimes \rho_{567}$
$\rho_{56} \otimes \rho_{56}$
$\rho_{67} \otimes \rho_{67}$
$\rho_6 \otimes \rho_6$
$i_2(x_2)_{i_2}$
$i_3(x_3)_{i_3}$
$\rho_{12345} \oplus \rho_{12345}$
$+ \rho_{345} \oplus (\rho_3, \rho_{2345})$
$+ \rho_{34567} \oplus (\rho_3, \rho_{234567})$
$+ \rho_{1234567} \oplus \rho_{1234567}$
$\rho_{1234} \otimes \rho_{1234} + \rho_{3456} \otimes (\rho_3, \rho_{23456}) + \rho_{123456} \otimes \rho_{123456}$
$\rho_{34} \otimes (\rho_3, \rho_{234})$
$+ \rho_4 \oplus \rho_4 + \rho_{456} \oplus \rho_{456}$
$+ \rho_{23456} \oplus \rho_{23456}$
$\rho_{234} \oplus \rho_{234}$
$\rho_{23} \otimes \rho_{23}$
$\rho_{4567} \otimes \rho_{4567} + \rho_{2345} \otimes \rho_{2345}$
$\rho_{45} \otimes \rho_{45} + \rho_{234567} \otimes \rho_{234567}$
$i_0(x_0)_{i_0}$
$i_1(x_1)_{i_1}$
$\rho_1 \otimes \rho_1$
$+ \rho_3 \otimes (\rho_3, \rho_{23})$
$+ \rho_{123} \otimes \rho_{123}$
$\rho_4 \otimes \rho_4 + \rho_{456} \otimes \rho_{3456}$
$\rho_{45} \otimes \rho_{345}$
$+ \rho_{4567} \otimes \rho_{34567}$
$\rho_{123} \oplus \rho_{12} + \rho_3 \oplus (\rho_3, \rho_2)$
$\rho_2 \oplus 1$
$1 \oplus \rho_3$
$\rho_{23} \oplus \rho_2$
$i_1(r)_{i_0}$

FIGURE 12. Bimodule ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}N(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$.



FIGURE 13. Heegaard diagram $\mathcal{H}(M_{\tau_C^{-1}})$ for left handed Dehn twist along the curve C.



FIGURE 14. Bimodule ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}N(\tau_C^{-1})_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$.



FIGURE 15. Heegaard diagram for M_{id} with no periodic domains, where $id : F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2) \to F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ is the identity mapping class of genus 2 surface.



FIGURE 16. Bimodule ${}^{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}[\mathbb{I}]^b_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}$.

3. Fixed point Floer cohomology

At first fixed point Floer homology was defined for symplectomorphisms which are Hamiltonian isotopic to the identity, by Andreas Floer in [9]. It was extended to other symplectomorphisms by Stamatis Dostoglou and Dietmar Salamon in [7]. Paul Seidel in [18] studied fixed point Floer homology of Dehn twists on surfaces, and then defined it for other mapping classes in [19]. For the construction of fixed point Floer homology we refer the reader to the articles [10], [6], [23], [25]. Here we summarize how does it work. We will be working with fixed point Floer cohomology, rather then homology.

3.1. **Setup.**

Construction 3.1 (for closed surfaces)**.** Consider a closed oriented surface Σ_g with genus $g > 1$. There is a classical version of fixed point Floer cohomology for orientation preserving mapping classes ϕ, which we denote by $HF(\phi)$. The construction is as follows. Choose a symplectic area form ω, and an area-preserving monotone representative ϕ of a mapping class (see [19] for the definition of monotone, and particularly for why Floer homology does not depend on this choice). Then the chain complex $CF_*(\phi)$ is generated over $\mathbb{F}^2$ by non-degenerate fixed points of ϕ. These are fixed points where $det(d\phi - Id) \neq 0$. For generic ϕ all fixed points are non-degenerate (hence isolated). In the definition one can assume non-degeneracy, but in practice to achieve it one perturbs ϕ by time 1 isotopy $\psi^1_{X_{H_t}}$ along Hamiltonian vector field X_{H_t}, where $H : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ is a time-dependent generic Hamiltonian. So by considering $\phi \circ \psi^1_{X_{H_t}}$ if necessary, we assume now that fixed points of ϕ are non-degenerate. Note that fixed points of ϕ are constant sections of the mapping torus $T_\phi = \Sigma \times [0,1]/(\phi(x), 0) \sim (x, 1)$. The differential $\partial : CF_*(\phi) \to CF_{*-1}(\phi)$ is defined using counting pseudo-holomorphic cylinders inside $T_\phi \times \mathbb{R}$, which limit to constant section at $\pm\infty$. One counts only index 1 cylinders (i.e. those which come in 1-dimensional family), up to translation along $\mathbb{R}$. The differential goes from $+$ to $-$, as in Morse homology. Almost complex structure on $T_\phi \times \mathbb{R}$ comes by picking generic time-dependent almost complex structure on Σ and extending to the rest of the tangent space naturally, i.e. direction of circle inside T_ϕ and direction of $\mathbb{R}$ are interchanged. This differential satisfies $\partial^2 = 0$, and passing to the homology of the dual complex $HF^*(\phi) = H(CF^*(\phi), d)$ gives *fixed point Floer cohomology* — an invariant, which depends only on the mapping class ϕ. $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading on this invariant is provided via the sign of $det(d\phi - Id)$ at fixed points.

Construction 3.2 (for surfaces with boundary)**.** There is a natural generalization of the above invariant to the with boundary. Suppose $\Sigma = (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma = U_1 \cup U_2 \cup \cdots \cup U_n)$ is an oriented surface with boundary, of any genus. We will consider orientation preserving mapping classes $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma)$ fixing the boundary. Choose an exact area-preserving representative (see [10, Appendix C], or [25, Lemma 3.3] for independence on this choice). Because we want every fixed point to be non-degenerate, we will need to perturb ϕ near the boundary. Thus, in order to specify these perturbations, as an input we will also take decorations of every boundary component with a sign. These decorations tell us how does perturbation look like. If U_i is decorated by $(+)$, then perturbation in the neighborhood of U_i is a twist in the direction of orientation of U_i (same direction as the Reeb flow on the boundary). This corresponds to Hamiltonian H being time-independent local maximum on U_i, see Figure 17. If U_j is decorated by $(-)$, then perturbation should be a twist in the opposite of induced orientation, i.e. Hamiltonian should be a local minimum on C_j. These twists near the boundary should be small enough, i.e. $\leqslant 2\pi$ if one full twist is 2π.

We denote the resulting fixed point Floer cohomology by $HF^*(\phi\,;\ U_1\pm, U_2\pm, \ldots, U_n\pm) = HF^*(\phi\,;\ U+, U-)$, where we denote $U+$ (respectively $U-$) to be a union of positively (respectively negatively) decorated components.



FIGURE 17. Perturbation twists near the boundary.

Remark. Notice that the naming of the twists comes from comparing the direction of the twist with orientation on the boundary. It is not related to positive or negative Dehn twists. In fact, positive (+) direction of twisting corresponds to the left handed twisting, which appears in the negative (left handed) Dehn twists. (−) direction of twisting corresponds to the right handed twisting, which appears in positive (right handed) Dehn twist.

Remark. Note, that paths of exact symplectomorphisms are Hamiltonian isotopies, see [25, Lemma 2.33].

3.2. **Existing computational methods.** First of all, in the case of identity mapping class the Floer cohomology is the same as Morse cohomology with respect to the Hamiltonian we use for perturbation of id. See [23, Lemma 3.9] for a proof and references to the original works. Thus we have $HF^*(id\,;\ U+, U-) = H^*(\Sigma,\ U-)$, because Hamiltonian is local minimum on the curves in $U-$ and local maximum for the curves in $U+$.

First computations for non-trivial mapping classes were done by Seidel in [18]. Suppose ϕ is a composition of right handed Dehn twists along curves $R = \{R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_l\}$ and left handed Dehn twists along $L = \{L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_k\}$. Suppose all the curves are disjoint and their complement has no disc components, and that no L_i is homotopic to R_j. Then $HF^*(\phi\,;\ U+, U-) = H^*(\Sigma - L,\ R \cup U-)$. This result is achieved again via reducing computation to the Morse cohomology, where the Hamiltonian is local minimum on the curves R_i and local maximum on the curves L_j.

Then Ralf Gautschi in [10] computed fixed point Floer homology for algebraically finite mapping classes (those are periodic mapping classes, and also reducible ones where the map on each component is periodic). Eaman Eftekhary in [8] then generalized Seidel's work to Dehn twists along the curves which form a forest, see below. The last computations were done by Andrew Cotton-Clay in [6], where he showed how to compute fixed point Floer homology for all pseudo-Anosov mapping classes and for all reducible ones (including those with Pseudo-Anosov components). Thus there is a way to compute fixed point Floer homology for any mapping class.

For our purposes we will need the following theorem (which is a generalization of Eftekhary's work to the case with boundary):

Theorem 3.3 (Eftekhary)**.** *Suppose Σ is a surface with boundary, and $\phi : MCG_0(\Sigma)$ is a mapping class fixing the boundary. Suppose ϕ is a composition of right handed Dehn twists along the forest of transversely intersecting curves $R = \{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_l\}$ (i.e. there are no cycles in the intersection graph of curves), along with left handed Dehn twists along the other forest of curves $L = \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_m\}$. We assume that $L_i \cap R_j = \emptyset$, that no L_i is homotopic to R_j, and all the curves are homologically essential. Then*

$$HF^*(\phi\,;\ U+, U-) = H^*(\Sigma - L,\ R \cup U-)$$

4. Conjectural isomorphism

4.1. **Statement.** As in the Section 2 we consider mapping class group $MCG_0(\Sigma)$ of genus g surface with one boundary component. Because we want to be able to take fixed point Floer cohomology of ϕ, we assume genus to be greater then one.

Having a mapping class $\phi : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma = U_1 = S^1) \to (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma = U_1 = S^1)$, let us consider induced $\tilde{\phi} : (\tilde{\Sigma}, \partial\tilde{\Sigma} = U_1 \cup U_2) \to (\tilde{\Sigma}, \partial\tilde{\Sigma} = U_1 \cup U_2)$, where $\tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma \setminus D^2$ is obtained by removing a disc in the small enough neighborhood of the boundary, such that ϕ is identity on that neighborhood.

Conjecture 4.1. *There is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector spaces*

$$HH_*(N(\phi^{-1})) \cong HF^{*+1}(\tilde{\phi}\,;\ U_2+, U_1-)$$

We support this conjecture by computations in the genus 2 case below. Then we describe symplectic geometric interpretation of bordered Heegaard Floer homology in Section 5. Based on that, in Section 6, we outline a construction of the map potentially giving an isomorphism (in the double basepoint version of it). It comes from an open-closed map for partially wrapped Fukaya category, associated to a Lefschetz fibration.

Remark. The reason why on the left side of isomorphism we have ϕ^{-1} is because the bimodule coming from bordered theory is homotopy equivalent to $\bigoplus_{i,j} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j))$ (see Section 5 for the explanation of this), and bimodule defined in [23] is $\bigoplus_{i,j} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\phi(\alpha_i), \alpha_j) \simeq \bigoplus_{i,j} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi^{-1}(\alpha_j))$, see subsection 6.4 for more on this.

4.2. **Computations.** Here we perform computations in the genus two case. As in the Section 2, we fix a set of curves generating mapping class group as on the Figure 6, and use a parameterization $\Sigma_2 \cong F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}_2)$ as on the Figure 7.

For tensoring DA bimodules and for computing Hochschild homology we used a computer program [28]. For computing fixed point Floer cohomology we used Theorem 3.3.

Computation 4.2 ($\phi = id$)**.** For $\phi = id$ we have that Hochschild homology is $HH_*(N(id)) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$, which is generated by all the four generators of $N(id)$ (note, that all of them have identical left and right idempotents, which means that they contribute to $HC_*(N(id))$). All four generators have grading 0. Fixed point Floer cohomology in this case is $HF^*(\tilde{id};\, U_2+, U_1-) = H^*(\tilde{\Sigma}_2,\, U_1) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$, all concentrated in the grading 1, see Figure 18 for an illustration (by MH^* we denote Morse cohomology).



FIGURE 18. Computation for $id : (\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2) \to (\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2)$.

Computation 4.3 ($\phi = \tau_l$)**.** Suppose $\phi = \tau_l$ is a right handed Dehn twist around any of the curves A, B, C, D,or E. Then we have the same ranks as for identity: Hochschild homology is $HH_*(N(\tau_l^{-1})) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$. Fixed point Floer cohomology in this case is $HF^*(\tilde{\tau}_l\,;\, U_2+, U_1-) = H^*(\tilde{\Sigma}_2, l \cup U_1) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$, which corresponds to cutting $\tilde{\Sigma}_2$ along l and computing Morse cohomology w.r.t. Hamiltonian which looks like on the Figure 19. Gradings for both invariants are the same as in the previous computation.



FIGURE 19. Computation for one right handed Dehn twist $\tau_l : (\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2) \to (\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2)$.

Computation 4.4 ($\phi = \tau_l^{-1}$)**.** For left handed Dehn twist we have the same answers, $HH_*(N(\tau_l)) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$, and $HF^*(\tilde{\tau_l}^{-1}\,;\, U_2+, U_1-) = H^*(\tilde{\Sigma}_2 - l, U_1) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$, which corresponds to cutting $\tilde{\Sigma}_2$ along l and computing Morse cohomology w.r.t. Hamiltonian which looks like on the Figure 20. Gradings of both invariants are the same as in the previous examples.



FIGURE 20. Computation for one left handed Dehn twist $\tau_l^{-1} : (\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2) \to (\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2)$.

Experimenting with mapping classes arising from two disjoint forests of curves (i.e. those where one can use Eftekhary's result), we always got equal ranks of homologies. Let us highlight two more examples.

Computation 4.5 ($\phi = \tau_A\tau_B\tau_C\tau_D$)**.** In this case $HH_*(N(\tau_D^{-1}\tau_C^{-1}\tau_B^{-1}\tau_A^{-1}) = \mathbb{F}_2$, and $HF^*(\tau_A\tau_B\tilde{\tau}_C\tau_D\,;\, U_2+, U_1-) = H^*(\tilde{\Sigma}_2, U_1 \cup A \cup B \cup C \cup D) = \mathbb{F}_2$. It is the lowest rank that we observed in our computations. It is interesting to know if it is the global minimum, i.e. if there are mapping classes satisfying $HH_*(N(\phi)) = 0$.

Computation 4.6 ($\phi = \tau_A^5\tau_B\tau_C\tau_D\tau_E^5$)**.** This mapping class is pseudo-Anosov if viewed as a mapping class of closed genus two surface (see [8]). In this case $HH_*(N(\phi^{-1}) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^{10}$, and $HF^*(\tilde{\phi}\,;\, U_2+, U_1-) = H^*(\tilde{\Sigma}_2, U_1 \cup 5A \cup B \cup C \cup D \cup 5E) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^{10}$.

5. Bordered theory vs Fukaya categories

Material in this section serves as a preparation for the subsequent Section 6.

Let us repeat the way we associate a bimodule to a mapping class in the Section 2. To a surface one associates an algebraic structure, a *dg*-algebra in our case. To a mapping class one associates an A_∞ bimodule over that algebra. To a composition of mapping classes one associates a tensor product operation of bimodules. Here we describe another geometric way to arrive at the same mapping class invariant, which is based on partially wrapped Fukaya categories associated to a surface with one boundary component. This geometric structure was developed in [1], [2] by Denis Auroux in order to reinterpret bordered Heegaard Floer theory using Fukaya categories.

5.1. **Auroux's construction.** Fix a surface with one (or more) boundary component and a set of points on the boundary $(\Sigma, Z \subset \partial\Sigma)$. Fix a Liouville domain structure on Σ, i.e. such an exact symplectic form $\omega = d\theta$, that Liouville vector field X_θ dual to θ points outwards the boundary. We assume that every boundary component has at least one point from Z. Then one associates to that data a partially wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)$ (Auroux also considers Fukaya categories of symmetric products of higher powers, but we only need the first one, i.e. the surface itself). Denote by $\hat{\Sigma}$ a Liouville manifold, which is obtained by a completion of the surface by a cylindrical end. I.e. consider a symplectization of the boundary $([0, +\infty) \times \partial\Sigma, d(r \cdot \theta))$, and glue its negative part to Liouville flow collar neighborhood of $\partial\Sigma$ by $i : ((0, 1] \times \partial\Sigma, d(r \cdot \theta)) \to ((-\infty, 0] \times \partial\Sigma, \omega) \subset \Sigma$, s.t. $i((r, x)) = (e^r, x)$.

Objects of partially wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)$ consist of exact Lagrangian closed submanifolds in $\hat{\Sigma}$, as well as non-compact properly embedded ones, such that the ends stabilize to be rays in a cylindrical end, see [1] for details. Morphism spaces are Lagrangian Floer cochain complexes $hom_{\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)}(L_1, L_2) = CF^*_{Lagr}(\tilde{L_1}, L_2)$, where $\tilde{L_1}$ is a Lagrangian submanifolds perturbed by generic Hamiltonian. Because of non-compact Lagrangians, the behavior of Hamiltonian perturbation at infinity of $\hat{\Sigma}$ needs to be specified. Specifically constructed Hamiltonian wraps the ray of the arc around the cylindrical end until it reaches the "stop", i.e. one of the rays in $Z \times [1, +\infty)$. See [1] for the details, and Figure 21 for a schematic picture. A_∞ operations

$$hom_{\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)}(L_0, L_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes hom_{\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)}(L_{d-1}, L_d) \to hom_{\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)}(L_0, L_d)$$

are given by counting holomorphic discs with $d + 1$ marked points on the boundary.



FIGURE 21. Perturbation near infinity for partially wrapped Fukaya category of a surface.

As shown in [2, Theorem 1], if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \subset \Sigma$ are non-intersecting arcs, and their compliment is a set of discs each having one point from Z, then they generate $\mathcal{F}_Z(\Sigma)$ (this means that in the certain enlarged category every object is quasi-isomorphic to the iterated mapping cones between generating objects, see [3, Section 3] for the details). This follows from the fact that Lefschetz thimbles generate Fukaya-Seidel category associated to a Lefschetz fibration, see book [21]. Fukaya-Seidel category is closely related to partially wrapped Fukaya category, see the next Section 6.

Notice that picking a set of generating arcs on the surface is equivalent to picking a parameterization of a surface.

In particular, surface $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z})$, associated to a genus g pointed matched circle $\mathcal{Z}$, has a distinguished set of generators of $\mathcal{F}_z(F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}))$, which corresponds to the matched pairs of points in $\mathcal{Z}$, see surface on the right of Figure 1.

Theorem 5.1 (Auroux)**.** *Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g}$ are arcs in $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}) = \Sigma$ corresponding to the matched pairs in $\mathcal{Z}$. Then bordered one-strand-moving dg-algebra is equal (i.e. homotopy equivalent to) to the A_∞ hom-algebra of partially wrapped Fukaya category w.r.t. the generating set $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g}$, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}) \simeq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)) := \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant 2g} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$$

Remark. The full statement of Auroux's theorem involves all the summands of bordered algebra and Fukaya categories of symmetric products: for $0 \leqslant k \leqslant 2g$ one has $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Z}, -g + k) \simeq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{F}_z(Sym^k(\Sigma))) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant C^k_{2g}} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(Sym^k(\Sigma))}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)$, where $\{\lambda_i\}$ is a set of generators coming from the products of k arcs in $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g}$.

Remark. Having a finite set of generating objects $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ is very useful, because Yoneda embedding construction (see [3, Section 3.4]) then gives a fully faithful embedding of A_∞ category into the category of A_∞ modules over *hom*-algebra $\bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$. In particular, having a Heegaard diagram for bordered 3-manifold, Auroux identified not only algebras, but also type A bordered Heegaard Floer module with a module coming from Fukaya category via Yoneda embedding construction.

Example 5.2 (torus algebra)**.** Let us illustrate the above theorem on a torus. The way you get the torus bordered algebra from a pointed matched circle is pictured on the Figure 22. You can see the corresponding elements of the algebra on the Figure 23. They appear as generators of Lagrangian Floer complexes. One cannot see the product structure (i.e. holomorphic triangles) on this picture, because for that one needs to pick consistent choice of perturbations for three Lagrangians involved in the product operation.

5.2. **Alternative bimodule construction via Fukaya categories.** An exact self-diffeomorphism of $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma = S^1)$ fixing the boundary induces an exact compactly supported self-diffeomorphism of a surface $\hat{\Sigma}$. There is a standard way to associate to it an A_∞ bimodule over *hom*-algebra of Fukaya category $F_z(\Sigma)$ (which is the same as bordered algebra in our case). Namely, if $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ generate the Fukaya category, then bimodule as a vector space is equal to

$$N_F(\phi) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j)) \tag{5.1}$$

, and higher actions are given using A_∞ operations. For example action $m^{1|1|1} : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)) \otimes N_F(\phi) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)) \to N_F(\phi)$ is given via the following operation counting holomorphic discs with 4 marked points ("rectangles"):

$$\left(\bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)\right) \otimes \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j))\right) \otimes \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\phi(\alpha_i), \phi(\alpha_j))\right) \to$$
$$\to \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_z(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j))$$



FIGURE 22. Torus bordered algebra, constructed from genus 1 pointed matched circle.



FIGURE 23. Bordered algebra elements in the genus 1 case, viewed as elements of morphism spaces between generating objects of partially wrapped Fukaya category of a torus.

Note that this bimodule is of AA type in the bordered theory terminology, whereas $N(\phi)$ was DA type. Now we unify the two constructions of bimodules over the same algebra.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g}$ are arcs in $F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}) = \Sigma$ corresponding to the matched pairs in the circle $\mathcal{Z}$. Then two bimodules associated to a mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}), F^\circ(\mathcal{Z}))$ are the same (homotopy equivalent), i.e.*

$$N(\phi) \simeq N_F(\phi)$$

For the proof we refer the reader to [4, Lemma 4.2]. The main idea is to use α-β-bordered Heegaard diagrams introduced in [17].

6. Construction of a map in the double basepoint version of isomorphism

In this section we are going to explain how we arrived to the Conjecture 4.1. We will state the double basepoint version of it, and will show that it is a special case of a more general conjecture.

6.1. **From one basepoint to two: bimodule.** Let us explain how to modify our previous constructions of bimodules if we want to have two basepoints instead of one. First of all, partially wrapped Fukaya category was defined for any number of basepoints. On Figure 24 we draw a generating set of Lagrangians (red curves) in the genus two case, together with their perturbations (purple curves). Now we have five Lagrangian arcs as generators, instead of four in the one basepoint case (Figure 1). In general the number of generating arcs will be 2g+1 and 2g for 2 and 1 basepoint cases.



Figure 24. Generators of partially wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma_2)$.

After choosing this set of generators it is now clear what the corresponding pointed matched circle looks like, as well as the corresponding algebra, see Figure 25.



FIGURE 25. Genus 2 double basepoint example of how you get a *dg*-algebra out of pointed matched circle. Paths consisting of different color arrows are prohibited.

It is now possible to define an A_∞ bimodule (AA type) for a mapping class $\phi \in MCG_0(\Sigma)$ via partially wrapped Fukaya category:

$$N_F^{2bp}(\phi) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j)).$$

Though for computations one would prefer to have a DA type bimodule $N^{2bp}(\phi)$. And such bimodule, as in the one basepoint case, comes from a Heegaard diagram for mapping cylinder, but equipped with two basepoints on each boundary, and two arcs connecting them. Heegaard bordered diagrams with multiple basepoints were defined by Rumen Zarev in [26]. On the Figure 26 we draw a diagram for identity mapping class in the genus two case. The generalization for other mapping classes is analogous to 1 basepoint case. Two diagrams on Figure 26 are equivalent. On the right there is Zarev's bordered sutured Heegaard diagram, and on the left we drew a double basepoint Heegaard diagram, which would be a natural generalization of one basepoint diagram. Two diagrams carry the same holomorphic information, and bimodules coming from them are the same. The reason why they are different is that Zarev works with sutured manifolds and their bordered versions. In order to go from the left diagram to the right, instead of drawing basepoints and basepoint arcs one essentially deletes their neighborhoods and then says that boundary coming from these neighborhoods (drawn in green) are forbidden for holomorphic discs.

Hochschild homologies of one and two basepoint bimodules are related, and one actually has

$$rk(HH_*(N^{2bp}(\phi)) = rk(HH_*(N(\phi)) + 1$$

The reason is that Hochschild homology of double basepoint bimodule is equal to knot Floer homology of binding of an open book in second to lowest Alexander grading, where



FIGURE 26. Double basepoint diagrams for mapping cylinder of $id : \Sigma_2 \to \Sigma_2$.

knot on Heegaard diagram is specified by four basepoints, instead of two: $HH_*(N^{2bp}(\phi)) = \widehat{HFK}^{4bp}(M^\circ_\phi, K\,;\,-g)$. And the difference between four basepoint and a regular two basepoint knot Floer homology is known, $\widehat{HFK}^{4bp}(M^\circ_\phi, K) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^2 \otimes \widehat{HFK}(M^\circ_\phi, K)$, where the Alexander gradings of two generators of $(\mathbb{F}_2)^2$ are 0 and -1. Thus one has

$$rk(HH_*(N^{2bp}(\phi)) = rk(\widehat{HFK}^{4bp}(M^\circ_\phi, K\,;\,-g)) =$$
$$= rk(\widehat{HFK}(M^\circ_\phi, K\,;\,-g+1) \oplus \widehat{HFK}(M^\circ_\phi, K\,;\,-g)) = rk(HH_*(N(\phi)) + 1,$$

because the lowest $-g$ Alexander grading of knot Floer homology of a fibered knot (i.e. binding of an open book) is always one.

6.2. **From one basepoint to two: fixed point Floer cohomology.** Let us first explain the choice of fixed point Floer cohomology for one basepoint case.

There is a natural version of fixed point Floer cohomology $HF^{1bp}(\phi)$ which is equal to $HF^*(\tilde{\phi}\,;\,U_2+, U_1-)$, but defined without deleting a second disc from the surface. In Section 3 we decided not to give a rigorous definition of it (which would be analogous to [23, Section 6]), and rather use existing methods and work with $HF^*(\tilde{\phi}\,;\,U_2+, U_1-)$. But let us indicate the setup — $HF^{1bp}(\phi)$ can be defined only for infinite area surfaces with cylindrical end, rather then compact surfaces with boundary, and so one has to work with induced compactly supported exact self-diffeomorphisms on the completion $\hat{\Sigma}$. Behavior of the Hamiltonian used for perturbation near infinity should be a very specific one, see Figure

27, the left side. Upwards and downwards the Hamiltonian is linear w.r.t. radial coordinate. Comparing left and the right side of the figure (on the right we glued the blue boundaries together), you can also see why such Hamiltonian perturbation is equivalent to considering $HF^*(\tilde{\phi}\,;\, U_2+, U_1-)$ — generators (fixed points) and differentials in Floer cohomology with perturbation on the left side and on the right side are in one to one correspondence.



$$HF^{1bp}(\phi) \cong HF(\tilde{\phi};\, U_2+, U_1-)$$

FIGURE 27. On the left: behavior of Hamiltonian perturbation one actually needs to consider in one basepoint case, and equivalent to it theory on the right in terms of classical version of fixed point Floer cohomology, where Hamiltonian is constant on boundaries.

Let us explain why we call it a one basepoint case. The Hamiltonian on the left side of the diagram could be used to define perturbations in partially wrapped Fukaya category with one basepoint. One should imagine that basepoint is in the bottom part of infinity, and Lagrangian arcs are allowed to go only to the upper part of infinity. Then perturbation will send all the arcs to the left, i.e. to the basepoint.

Remark. When defining perturbations in partially wrapped Fukaya category, one has to make sure every Lagrangian arc will be wrapped enough to intersect the other ones to the left of it at infinity (see Figure 23). Thus one actually cannot consider linear Hamiltonian w.r.t. radial coordinate $H = r$ on upper half of infinity, as it is pictured on Figure 27. Instead, in order to make sure that Hamiltonian has big enough derivative for every pair of Lagrangian arcs, one needs to take a limit $H = \delta r, \delta \to +\infty$, as it was done in [1, Definition 4.1]. But because we always consider only finite number of generating arcs going to infinity, it is enough to just consider linear Hamiltonian with big enough derivative $H = \delta r, \delta \gg 0$.

Now we consider the double basepoint counterpart of the above construction. The corresponding behavior of Hamiltonian near infinity is pictured on the left of Figure 28, and we denote the resulting fixed point Floer cohomology by $HF^{2bp}(\phi)$. This cohomology theory was developed in [23, Section 6], where one considers a surface as a total space of 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration over $\mathbb{C}$. The corresponding version of classical Floer cohomology (where Hamiltonian is constant on boundary components) is depicted on the right — instead of one disc one needs to take out two discs this time, and we denote the resulting Floer cohomology by $HF(\tilde{\tilde{\phi}}\,;\, U_2+, U_3+, U_1-)$.



$$HF^{2bp}(\phi) \cong HF(\tilde{\tilde{\phi}};\ U_2+, U_3+, U_1-)$$

FIGURE 28. On the left: behavior of Hamiltonian perturbation one actually needs to consider in two basepoints case (see [23, Section 6] for a rigorous setup), and equivalent to it theory on the right in terms of classical version of fixed point Floer cohomology, where Hamiltonian is constant on boundaries.

One and two basepoint versions of fixed point Floer cohomology should be related, and for all the cases we considered, as in the case of Hochschild homologies, one has

$$rk(HF^*(\tilde{\tilde{\phi}}\,;\ U_2+, U_3+, U_1-)) = rk(HF^*(\tilde{\phi}\,;\ U_2+, U_1-)) + 1.$$

We did not find the general explanation for this. The reason might be that if one compares cochain complexes, then they are identical except $CF^*(\tilde{\tilde{\phi}}\,;\ U_2+, U_3+, U_1-)$ has one more generator x depicted on the right of Figure 28. This generator does not have any differential going out of it, as they are gradient lines going up from x for suitable Hamiltonian, and there are no generators above x. Most likely it also does not have any differentials going in (or, rather, one can arrange the Hamiltonian in such a way).

Now we are ready to state a double basepoint version of Conjecture 4.1. Namely, the following should be true:

$$HH_*(N^{2bp}(\phi^{-1})) \cong HF^{*+1}(\tilde{\tilde{\phi}}\,;\ U_2+, U_3+, U_1-).$$

6.3. **Lefschetz fibration structure on the surface.** Take an area preserving double branched cover of an exact surface with cylindrical end over complex numbers $f : \hat{\Sigma}_g \to \mathbb{C}$ (as an example one might take a quotient by hyperelliptic involution, which we drew below). One can view this cover as an exact symplectic fibration with singularities, as in [23, Setup 5.1]. This fibration is in fact a 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration, with 2g+1 critical points. Being Lefschetz fibration corresponds to critical points not having more then order two branching (i.e. triple and more branch covers also can be Lefschetz fibrations). We assume that critical values $p_1, \dots, p_{2g+1}$ all satisfy $Re(p_i) = 0$ and $Im(p_1) < \dots < Im(p_{2g+1})$. The genus 2 case is drawn on the Figure 29.

First, let us repeat that the structure of the exact symplectic fibration can be used to define a particular version of fixed point Floer cohomology. Following [23, Section 6], having



FIGURE 29. 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration structure on the genus 2 surface.

an exact compactly supported self-diffeomorphism $\phi : \hat{\Sigma} \to \hat{\Sigma}$ of 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration, one can consider fixed point Floer cohomology $HF^*(\phi, \delta > 0, \epsilon)$, where ϵ is not important to us because fibers of $f : \hat{\Sigma} \to \mathbb{C}$ do not have boundary, and δ is responsible for perturbation at infinity by Hamiltonian $H(x) = \delta Re(f(x))$. This theory depends only on the sign of δ, and for $\delta > 0$ is the cohomology theory from the previous subsection:

$$HF^{2bp}(\phi) = HF^*(\phi, \delta > 0).$$

Lefschetz fibration structure over the complex plane can be also used to define a special type of A_∞ category $\mathcal{F}_f(\hat{\Sigma})$, which is called Fukaya-Seidel category (see [20], [21], and more recent articles [22], [23] for a more relevant setup for us). In our double branched cover case the objects of the category are compact exact Lagrangians in $\hat{\Sigma}$ and also non-compact ones which are Lefschetz thimbles (in our case they are just preimages) associated to admissible arcs in $\mathbb{C}$. Admissible arcs in $\mathbb{C}$ are proper rays which start at the critical value of f, do not pass over other critical values, and at some point stabilize to be horizontal, oriented to the right rays. Perturbation at infinity is defined by pulling back to $\hat{\Sigma}$ Hamiltonian $H = \delta Re(z), \delta \gg 0$ on $\mathbb{C}$. It is exactly the same type of Hamiltonian perturbation as for $\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)$, see the left side of Figure 28.

Fukaya-Seidel category $\mathcal{F}_f(\hat{\Sigma})$ is closely related (quasi-equivalent) to partially wrapped Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)$, despite of the fact that non-compact objects allowed are different. For a setup which mediates between partially wrapped category with two basepoints and Fukaya-Seidel category see [1, Section 3.2], where the Lefschetz fibration structure is used to define $\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)$. For the generalization of that setup to partially wrapped Fukaya category (which does not use fibration structure) see [1, Section 4.1].

It was proved in [21] that Lefschetz thimbles (one for each critical points) generate Fukaya-Seidel category. If one chooses generating set of thimbles for category $\mathcal{F}_f(\hat{\Sigma})$, then these thimbles also generate $\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)$. Moreover, *hom*-algebras are the same: $\bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_f(\hat{\Sigma})}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \simeq \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \simeq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}^{2bp})$, and bimodules corresponding to exact automorphism

$\phi : \hat{\Sigma} \to \hat{\Sigma}$ are also the same $\bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_f(\hat{\Sigma})}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j)) \simeq \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi(\alpha_j)) \simeq N^{2bp}(\phi)$.

An example of Lefschetz thimbles in the genus two case is drawn on the Figure 29, and the same set of generators for $\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)$ was drawn on the Figure 24.

6.4. **Open-closed map.** Open-closed map is a map between Hochschild homology of a bimodule corresponding to an automorphism of a symplectic manifold, and a fixed point Floer cohomology. We refer the reader to [23, Section 7] for the definition of this map in case where symplectic manifold is exact symplectic fibration with singularities over $\mathbb{C}$ (which include Lefschetz fibrations). This map counts isolated points in moduli space of holomorphic maps from a Riemann surface drawn on Figure 30 to $\hat{\Sigma}$, with a twist ϕ along the gray line (compare with [23, Figure 3]). These maps have the following boundary conditions. A twisted orbit of Hamiltonian vector field X_H on one end, which is equivalent to a constant section of $T_{\phi \circ \psi^1_{X_H}}$. And a chain of Lagrangians on the other, with consistent perturbations. Along the gray line the map has a twist ϕ. So the strip end with gray line limits to an intersection point of $\phi \circ \psi^1_{X_H}(L_3) \cap L_1$ to the left of the gray line, and to the intersection point $L_3 \cap (\phi \circ \psi^1_{X_H})^{-1}(L_1)$ to the right of the gray line.

In the setting of Lefschetz fibration Seidel in [23, Equation 7.15] defines a bimodule $\mathcal{P}(\phi, \delta, \epsilon) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom(\psi^1_{X_H}(\phi(\alpha_i)), \alpha_j)$. The ϵ doesn't play any role for us, because in our case of 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration there is no boundary in the fiber. The δ is responsible for Hamiltonian $H(x) = \delta Re(f(x))$ which is used to perturb ϕ at infinity. If one assumes $\delta \gg 0$ (so that generating Lagrangians are wrapped enough to intersect each other at infinity), then, in our case of 0-dimensional Lefschetz fibration, this bimodule is

$$\mathcal{P}(\phi, \delta \gg 0) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom(\psi^1_{X_H}(\phi(\alpha_i)), \alpha_j) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_f(\hat{\Sigma})}(\phi(\alpha_i), \alpha_j) =$$

$$= \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)}(\phi(\alpha_i), \alpha_j) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k} hom_{\mathcal{F}_{z_1,z_2}(\Sigma)}(\alpha_i, \phi^{-1}(\alpha_j)) = N^{2bp}(\phi^{-1}).$$

Now we turn our attention to [23, Conjecture 7.18], which is stated for Lefschetz fibrations of any rank. In our case this amounts to the following — there is an open-closed map which gives an isomorphism:

$$HH_*(\mathcal{P}(\phi, \delta \gg 0)) \xrightarrow{\sim} HF^{*+1}_{2bp}(\phi).$$

As a consequence, our double basepoint conjecture $HH_*(N^{2bp}(\phi^{-1})) \cong HF^{*+1}(\tilde{\tilde{\phi}};\, U_2+, U_3+, U_1-)$ is a special case of Seidel's conjecture. One basepoint version, i.e. Conjecture 4.1, most likely fits in a similar framework, where instead of Fukaya-Seidel category (which is quasi-equivalent to partially wrapped with two basepoints) one should work with one basepoint partially wrapped Fukaya category, and construct there an appropriate version of an open-closed map.



FIGURE 30. Open-closed map counts such holomorphic objects inside $\hat{\Sigma}$. Compare this to [23, Figure 3].

7. Appendix. Bimodules for Dehn twists on the genus two surface

The set of curves that we consider on the genus two surface is pictured on Figure 6. We list 10 DA type bimodules corresponding to the right and left handed Dehn twists along the curves A,B,C,D and E. Then we describe a DD bimodule for the Dehn twist τ_E, and also 6 arc-slide DA bimodules, which we used to compute $N(\tau_C^{-1})$ via factorization $\tau_C^{-1} = \eta^{-1}\mu_4\mu_3\mu_2\mu_1\eta$.

Bimodule 7.1. $N(\tau_A)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i1}(x2)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(x3)_{i0}$, ${}_{i3}(x0)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(x1)_{i2}$, ${}_{i2}(r)_{i3}$.

Actions: $x2\otimes(r23) \longrightarrow r23\otimes x2$, $x2\otimes(r2) \longrightarrow r2\otimes x3$, $x2\otimes(r234567) \longrightarrow r234567\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r4567) \longrightarrow r4567\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r456) \longrightarrow r456\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r23456) \longrightarrow r23456\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r234) \longrightarrow r234\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r4) \longrightarrow r4\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r45) \longrightarrow r456\otimes r$, $x2\otimes(r2345) \longrightarrow r23456\otimes r$, $x3\otimes(r123) \longrightarrow r123\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r1) \longrightarrow r1\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r3) \longrightarrow r3\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r12) \longrightarrow r12\otimes x3$, $x3\otimes(r34567) \longrightarrow r34567\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r1234) \longrightarrow r1234\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r3456) \longrightarrow r3456\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r34) \longrightarrow r34\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r123456) \longrightarrow r123456\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r345) \longrightarrow r3456\otimes r$, $x3\otimes(r12345) \longrightarrow r123456\otimes r$, $x0\otimes(r6,r567) \longrightarrow r67\otimes x0$, $x0\otimes(r6,r56) \longrightarrow r6\otimes x1$, $x0\otimes(r6,r5) \longrightarrow r6\otimes r$, $x1\otimes(r567) \longrightarrow r567\otimes x0$, $x1\otimes(r7) \longrightarrow r7\otimes x0$, $x1\otimes(r56) \longrightarrow r56\otimes x1$, $x1\otimes(r5) \longrightarrow r56\otimes r$, $r\otimes(r67) \longrightarrow r7\otimes x0$, $r\otimes() \longrightarrow r5\otimes x0$, $r\otimes(r6) \longrightarrow 1\otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.2. $N(\tau_A^{-1})$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i1}(x2)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(x3)_{i0}$, ${}_{i3}(x0)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(x1)_{i2}$, ${}_{i2}(r)_{i3}$.

Actions: $x2\otimes(r23) \longrightarrow r23\otimes x2$, $x2\otimes(r2) \longrightarrow r2\otimes x3$, $x2\otimes(r234567) \longrightarrow r234567\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r4567) \longrightarrow r4567\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r23456,r5) \longrightarrow r2345\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r456,r5) \longrightarrow r45\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r4) \longrightarrow r4\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r234) \longrightarrow r234\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r456) \longrightarrow r456\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r23456) \longrightarrow r23456\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r45) \longrightarrow r4\otimes r$, $x2\otimes(r2345) \longrightarrow r234\otimes r$, $x3\otimes(r1) \longrightarrow r1\otimes x2$,

$x3\otimes(r3) \longrightarrow r3\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r123) \longrightarrow r123\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r12) \longrightarrow r12\otimes x3$, $x3\otimes(r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r123456, r5) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r3456, r5) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes r$, $x3 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes r$, $x0 \otimes () \longrightarrow r6 \otimes r$, $x1 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r56, r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r$, $r \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x0$, $r \otimes (r6, r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x0$, $r \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.3. $N(\tau_B)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i1}(x2)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(x3)_{i0}$, ${}_{i3}(x0)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(x1)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(s)_{i2}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r234) \longrightarrow r234\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r4) \longrightarrow r4\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r456) \longrightarrow r4567\otimes s$, $x2\otimes(r23456) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes s$, $x3 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r34567) \longrightarrow r34567\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r34) \longrightarrow r34\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r1234) \longrightarrow r1234\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r3456) \longrightarrow r34567\otimes s$, $x3\otimes(r123456) \longrightarrow r1234567\otimes s$, $x0 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes s$, $x1 \otimes (r7, r67) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r7, r6) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes s$, $x1 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes s$, $s \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x0$, $s \otimes () \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x1$,.

Bimodule 7.4. $N(\tau_B^{-1})$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i1}(x2)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(x3)_{i0}$, ${}_{i3}(x0)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(x1)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(s)_{i2}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x0$, $x2 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x1$, $x2 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x1$, $x2 \otimes (r4567, r6) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x1$, $x2 \otimes (r234567, r6) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x1$, $x2 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes s$, $x2 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes s$, $x3\otimes(r1) \longrightarrow r1\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r3) \longrightarrow r3\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r123) \longrightarrow r123\otimes x2$, $x3\otimes(r12) \longrightarrow r12\otimes x3$, $x3\otimes(r34567) \longrightarrow r34567\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r345) \longrightarrow r345\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r12345) \longrightarrow r12345\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567\otimes x0$, $x3\otimes(r34) \longrightarrow r34\otimes x1$, $x3\otimes(r1234567, r6) \longrightarrow r123456\otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r34567, r6) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes s$, $x3 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes s$, $x0 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (r67, r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes s$, $x1 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r567, r6) \longrightarrow r56\otimes x1$, $x1\otimes(r56) \longrightarrow r5\otimes s$, $x1\otimes() \longrightarrow r7\otimes s$, $s\otimes(r7) \longrightarrow r67\otimes x0$, $s\otimes(r7, r6) \longrightarrow r6\otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.5. $N(\tau_C)$

16 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i1}(x2)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(x3)_{i0}$, ${}_{i3}(x0)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(x1)_{i2}$, ${}_{i1}(t8)_{i1}$, ${}_{i2}(t9)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(t6)_{i2}$, ${}_{i2}(t7)_{i1}$, ${}_{i1}(t4)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(t5)_{i2}$, ${}_{i1}(t2)_{i2}$, ${}_{i2}(t3)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(t1)_{i2}$, ${}_{i1}(t10)_{i0}$, ${}_{i2}(t11)_{i1}$, ${}_{i1}(t12)_{i1}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r45) \longrightarrow r45\otimes x0$, $x2\otimes(r23456) \longrightarrow r23456\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r4) \longrightarrow r4\otimes x1$, $x2\otimes(r234) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x1$, $x2 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x0$, $x3 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x1$, $x3 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes t9$, $x3 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes t7$, $x3 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes t5$, $x3 \otimes (r1, r4) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t2$, $x3 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes t3$, $x3 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes t1$, $x3 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes t11$, $x0 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x1$, $t8 \otimes () \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x2$, $t8 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t6$, $t8 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t7$, $t8 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t4$,

$t8 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t2$, $t9 \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $t9 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t7$, $t9 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t5$, $t9 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t3$, $t9 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t1$, $t6 \otimes () \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x1$, $t6 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t4$, $t6 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t5$, $t6 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t2$, $t7 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $t7 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t5$, $t7 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t3$, $t7 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t1$, $t4 \otimes () \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x0$, $t4 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t2$, $t4 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t3$, $t5 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $t5 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t3$, $t5 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t1$, $t2 \otimes () \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x1$, $t2 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t1$, $t3 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $t3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t1$, $t1 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $t10 \otimes () \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x3$, $t10 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t8$, $t10 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t9$, $t10 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t6$, $t10 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t4$, $t10 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t2$, $t11 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x0$, $t11 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x0$, $t11 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x1$, $t11 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x1$, $t11 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t9$, $t11 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t7$, $t11 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t5$, $t11 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t3$, $t11 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t1$, $t12 \otimes () \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x2$, $t12 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t8$, $t12 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t6$, $t12 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t4$, $t12 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t2$, $t12 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t10$, $t12 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t11$.

Bimodule 7.6. $N(\tau_C^{-1})$

16 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i2}(x2)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(x3)_{i3}$, ${}_{i0}(x0)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(x1)_{i1}$, ${}_{i2}(t8)_{i2}$, ${}_{i1}(t9)_{i3}$, ${}_{i2}(t6)_{i1}$, ${}_{i1}(t7)_{i2}$, ${}_{i2}(t4)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(t5)_{i1}$, ${}_{i2}(t2)_{i1}$, ${}_{i1}(t3)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(t1)_{i1}$, ${}_{i2}(t10)_{i3}$, ${}_{i1}(t11)_{i2}$, ${}_{i2}(t12)_{i2}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes () \longrightarrow r56 \otimes t8$, $x2 \otimes () \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t12$, $x3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes () \longrightarrow r6 \otimes t10$, $x0 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t9$, $x0 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t7$, $x0 \otimes () \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes t4$, $x0 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t5$, $x0 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t3$, $x0 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t1$, $x0 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes t11$, $x0 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes t11$, $x1 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes () \longrightarrow r456 \otimes t6$, $x1 \otimes () \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes t2$, $x1 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes t11$, $x1 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t11$, $t8 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t10$, $t8 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t12$, $t9 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $t9 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t10$, $t9 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t11$, $t6 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t8$, $t6 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t10$, $t6 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t12$, $t7 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $t7 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t8$, $t7 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t9$, $t7 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t11$, $t4 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t8$, $t4 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t6$, $t4 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t10$, $t4 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t12$, $t5 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $t5 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t9$, $t5 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t6$, $t5 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t7$, $t5 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t11$, $t2 \otimes (r4, r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$, $t2 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t8$, $t2 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t6$, $t2 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t4$, $t2 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t10$, $t2 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t12$, $t3 \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $t3 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t9$, $t3 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t7$, $t3 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t4$, $t3 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t5$, $t3 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t11$, $t1 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $t1 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t9$, $t1 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t7$, $t1 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t5$, $t1 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t2$, $t1 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t3$, $t1 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t11$, $t10 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes t12$, $t11 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $t11 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes t12$.

Bimodule 7.7. $N(\tau_D)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i2}(x2)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(x3)_{i3}$, ${}_{i0}(x0)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(x1)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(s)_{i1}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes s$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r1234) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r123456) \longrightarrow$

$r23456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r12345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r1234567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r12) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r123) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes (r2, r1) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes s$, $s \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2$, $s \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2$, $s \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x3$, $s \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3$, $s \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x0$, $s \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x1$, $s \otimes () \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.8. $N(\tau_D^{-1})$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i2}(x2)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(x3)_{i3}$, ${}_{i0}(x0)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(x1)_{i1}$, ${}_{i0}(s)_{i1}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (r12, r1) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes s$, $x1 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes () \longrightarrow r2 \otimes s$, $s \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2$, $s \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2$, $s \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $s \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3$, $s \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes x0$, $s \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1$, $s \otimes (r2, r1) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.9. $N(\tau_E)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i2}(x2)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(x3)_{i3}$, ${}_{i0}(x0)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(x1)_{i1}$, ${}_{i1}(r)_{i0}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r3, r23456) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r3, r234) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r3, r2345) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r3, r234567) \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r3, r23) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r3, r2) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes r$, $x0 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes r$, $x1 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes r$, $r \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2$, $r \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2$, $r \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3$, $r \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3$, $r \otimes () \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0$, $r \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.10. $N(\tau_E^{-1})$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i2}(x2)_{i2}$, ${}_{i3}(x3)_{i3}$, ${}_{i0}(x0)_{i0}$, ${}_{i1}(x1)_{i1}$, ${}_{i1}(r)_{i0}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r123, r2) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes r$, $x0 \otimes () \longrightarrow r3 \otimes r$, $x1 \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r23, r2) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r$, $r \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x2$, $r \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2$, $r \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $r \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3$, $r \otimes (r3, r2) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0$, $r \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x1$.

Bimodule 7.11. ${}_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)}DD(\tau_E)_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_2)^!}$

5 generators with their idempotents:
${}_{i2}(x2)_{|(0,2),(1,3),(5,7)|}$,
${}_{i3}(x3)_{|(0,2),(1,3),(4,6)|}$,
${}_{i0}(x0)_{|(1,3),(4,6),(5,7)|}$,
${}_{i1}(x1)_{|(0,2),(4,6),(5,7)|}$,
${}_{i1}(r)_{|(1,3),(4,6),(5,7)|}$.

Actions:
$x2 \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(1,3),(4 \to 7)|$, $x2 \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(1,3),(4 \to 5)|$, $x2 \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(1,3),(6 \to 7)|$, $x3 \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2 \otimes |(0,2),(1,3),(5 \to 6)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2 \otimes |(5,7),(1 \to 4),(2 \to 3)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2 \otimes |(1,3),(5,7),(0 \to 4)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2 \otimes |(5,7),(1 \to 6),(2 \to 3)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2 \otimes |(1,3),(5,7),(0 \to 6)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3 \otimes |(1,3),(4,6),(0 \to 7)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3 \otimes |(4,6),(1 \to 5),(2 \to 3)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3 \otimes |(1,3),(4,6),(0 \to 5)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x3 \otimes |(4,6),(1 \to 7),(2 \to 3)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1 \otimes |(4,6),(5,7),(0 \to 1)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1 \otimes |(4,6),(5,7),(0 \to 3)|$, $x0 \longrightarrow r3 \otimes r \otimes |(4,6),(5,7),(1 \to 3)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2 \otimes |(0,2),(5,7),(3 \to 4)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2 \otimes |(0,2),(5,7),(3 \to 6)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x2 \otimes |(0,2),(5,7),(1 \to 6)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2 \otimes |(0,2),(5,7),(1 \to 4)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(4,6),(3 \to 7)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(4,6),(1 \to 7)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(4,6),(3 \to 5)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3 \otimes |(0,2),(4,6),(1 \to 5)|$, $x1 \longrightarrow r23 \otimes r \otimes |(4,6),(5,7),(1 \to 2)|$, $r \longrightarrow r456 \otimes x2 \otimes |(1,3),(5,7),(2 \to 6)|$, $r \longrightarrow r4 \otimes x2 \otimes |(1,3),(5,7),(2 \to 4)|$, $r \longrightarrow r45 \otimes x3 \otimes |(1,3),(4,6),(2 \to 5)|$, $r \longrightarrow r4567 \otimes x3 \otimes |(1,3),(4,6),(2 \to 7)|$, $r \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0 \otimes 1$, $r \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x1 \otimes |(4,6),(5,7),(2 \to 3)|$.

Bimodule 7.12. $N(\eta)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{i2}(x2)_{|(3,5)|}$, ${}_{i3}(x3)_{|(4,7)|}$, ${}_{i0}(x0)_{|(0,2)|}$, ${}_{i1}(x1)_{|(1,6)|}$, ${}_{i2}(r)_{|(1,6)|}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (|(3 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (|(3 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r567 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (|(5 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (|(3 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow r5 \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r$, $x2 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r56 \otimes r$, $x3 \otimes (|(4 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (|(4 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r67 \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (|(4 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r6 \otimes r$, $x0 \otimes (|(2 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow r34 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (|(2 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow r1234 \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow r12345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (|(2 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r34567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r1234567 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (|(2 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow r345 \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow r12 \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (|(2 \to 3)|, |(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r3 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 1)|) \longrightarrow r1 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 3)|, |(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r123 \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r123456 \otimes r$, $x0 \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r3456 \otimes r$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow r234 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r234567 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow r2345 \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow r2 \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 3)|, |(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r23 \otimes x1$, $x1 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow r23456 \otimes r$, $x1 \otimes () \longrightarrow r4 \otimes r$, $r \otimes (|(6 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow r7 \otimes x3$.

Bimodule 7.13. $N(\mu_1)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{|(0,2)|}(y1)_{|(0,3)|}$, ${}_{|(3,5)|}(y0)_{|(2,4)|}$, ${}_{|(4,7)|}(y3)_{|(5,7)|}$, ${}_{|(1,6)|}(y2)_{|(1,6)|}$, ${}_{|(1,6)|}(r)_{|(2,4)|}$.

Actions: $y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 2)| \otimes y1$, $y1 \otimes (|(3 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 3)| \otimes y0$, $y1 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 3)| \otimes y0$, $y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 4)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(3 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 4)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(3 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow$

$|(2 \to 6)| \otimes y2,\ y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 6)| \otimes y2,\ y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 1)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 1)| \otimes y2,$
$y1 \otimes (|(0 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 1)| \otimes r,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to$
$7)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 7)| \otimes y3,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 6)| \otimes y2,$
$y0 \otimes () \longrightarrow |(5 \to 6)| \otimes r,\ y3 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y3 \otimes (|(5 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(4 \to 7)| \otimes y3,\ y3 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 6)| \otimes y2,\ y2 \otimes (|(1 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 2)| \otimes y1,$
$y2 \otimes (|(1 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 3)| \otimes y0,\ y2 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y2 \otimes (|(1 \to$
$5)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ y2 \otimes (|(1 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 7)| \otimes y3,\ y2 \otimes (|(6 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(6 \to 7)| \otimes y3,$
$y2 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 6)| \otimes y2,\ y2 \otimes (|(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 2)| \otimes y1,$
$r \otimes (|(2 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 3)| \otimes y0,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to$
$7)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 7)| \otimes y3,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 6)| \otimes y2.$

Bimodule 7.14. $N(\mu_2)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{|(1,6)|}(y1)_{|(1,6)|}$, ${}_{|(5,7)|}(y0)_{|(2,7)|}$, ${}_{|(0,3)|}(y3)_{|(0,4)|}$, ${}_{|(2,4)|}(y2)_{|(3,5)|}$, ${}_{|(1,6)|}(r)_{|(2,7)|}$.

Actions: $y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y1 \otimes (|(6 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(6 \to 7)| \otimes y0,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to$
$7)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 7)| \otimes y0,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(1 \to 3)| \otimes y3,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 4)| \otimes y2,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 2)| \otimes y2,$
$y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r,\ y0 \otimes () \longrightarrow |(5 \to 6)| \otimes r,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 1)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 1)| \otimes y1,\ y3 \otimes (|(4 \to$
$6)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y3 \otimes (|(4 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 7)| \otimes y0,$
$y3 \otimes (|(4 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 5)| \otimes y0,$
$y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 7)| \otimes y0,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 3)| \otimes y3,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(0 \to 4)| \otimes y2,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 2)| \otimes y2,\ y3 \otimes (|(4 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 4)| \otimes y2,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to$
$2)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 1)| \otimes r,\ y2 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 6)| \otimes y1,$
$y2 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 5)| \otimes y0,$
$y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 7)| \otimes y0,\ y2 \otimes (|(5 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 7)| \otimes y0,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(2 \to 3)| \otimes y3,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 4)| \otimes y2,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 6)| \otimes y1,$
$r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 7)| \otimes y0,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to$
$4)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 3)| \otimes y3,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 4)| \otimes y2,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 2)| \otimes y2.$

Bimodule 7.15. $N(\mu_3)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{|(1,6)|}(y1)_{|(1,6)|}$, ${}_{|(3,5)|}(y0)_{|(2,4)|}$, ${}_{|(0,4)|}(y3)_{|(0,5)|}$, ${}_{|(2,7)|}(y2)_{|(3,7)|}$, ${}_{|(1,6)|}(r)_{|(2,4)|}$.

Actions: $y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 5)| \otimes y0,$
$y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 3)| \otimes y0,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ y1 \otimes (|(6 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(6 \to 7)| \otimes y2,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 2)| \otimes y2,\ y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 7)| \otimes y2,$
$y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(3 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ y0 \otimes (|(4 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(3 \to 7)| \otimes y2,$
$y0 \otimes () \longrightarrow |(5 \to 6)| \otimes r,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 1)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to$
$1)| \otimes y1,\ y3 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 5)| \otimes y0,$
$y3 \otimes (|(5 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 3)| \otimes y0,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to$
$5)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ y3 \otimes (|(5 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(4 \to 7)| \otimes y2,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 7)| \otimes y2,$
$y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 2)| \otimes y2,\ y3 \otimes (|(0 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 1)| \otimes r,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(2 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 3)| \otimes y0,$
$y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 4)| \otimes y3,\ y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 7)| \otimes y2,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow$
$|(1 \to 6)| \otimes y1,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|, |(1 \to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 5)| \otimes y0,\ r \otimes (|(2 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 3)| \otimes y0,$

$r \otimes (|(2\to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 4)| \otimes y3$, $r \otimes (|(2\to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 7)| \otimes y2$, $r \otimes (|(2\to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 2)| \otimes y2$.

Bimodule 7.16. $N(\mu_4)$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{|(1,6)|}(y1)_{|(1,6)|}$, ${}_{|(0,5)|}(y0)_{|(0,2)|}$, ${}_{|(3,7)|}(y3)_{|(4,7)|}$, ${}_{|(2,4)|}(y2)_{|(3,5)|}$, ${}_{|(1,6)|}(r)_{|(0,2)|}$.

Actions: $y1 \otimes (|(1\to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 6)| \otimes y1$, $y1 \otimes (|(1\to 6)|, |(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(1 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 3)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(6 \to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(6\to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y1 \otimes (|(1\to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 4)| \otimes y2$, $y1 \otimes (|(1\to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 2)| \otimes y2$, $y1 \otimes (|(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes r$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 6)| \otimes y1$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 1)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 1)| \otimes y1$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 6)|, |(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 3)| \otimes y3$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 4)| \otimes y2$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 2)| \otimes y2$, $y0 \otimes () \longrightarrow |(5\to 6)| \otimes r$, $y0 \otimes (|(0\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(0\to 1)| \otimes r$, $y3 \otimes (|(4\to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(3\to 6)| \otimes y1$, $y3 \otimes (|(4\to 6)|, |(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(3\to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y3 \otimes (|(4\to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(3\to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y3 \otimes (|(4\to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(3\to 4)| \otimes y2$, $y2 \otimes (|(5\to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(4\to 6)| \otimes y1$, $y2 \otimes (|(3\to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(2\to 6)| \otimes y1$, $y2 \otimes (|(5\to 6)|, |(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(4\to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y2 \otimes (|(3\to 6)|, |(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(2\to 5)| \otimes y0$, $y2 \otimes (|(5\to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(4\to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y2 \otimes (|(3\to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(2\to 7)| \otimes y3$, $y2 \otimes (|(3\to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 3)| \otimes y3$, $y2 \otimes (|(3 \to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 4)| \otimes y2$, $r \otimes (|(2 \to 6)|) \longrightarrow |(1 \to 6)| \otimes y1$, $r \otimes (|(2\to 6)|, |(1\to 2)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 5)| \otimes y0$, $r \otimes (|(2\to 7)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 7)| \otimes y3$, $r \otimes (|(2 \to 4)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 3)| \otimes y3$, $r \otimes (|(2\to 3)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 2)| \otimes y2$, $r \otimes (|(2\to 5)|) \longrightarrow |(1\to 4)| \otimes y2$.

Bimodule 7.17. $N(\eta^{-1})$

5 generators with their idempotents: ${}_{|(3,5)|}(x2)_{i2}$, ${}_{|(4,7)|}(x3)_{i3}$, ${}_{|(0,2)|}(x0)_{i0}$, ${}_{|(1,6)|}(x1)_{i1}$, ${}_{|(3,5)|}(r)_{i1}$.

Actions: $x2 \otimes (r56) \longrightarrow |(3\to 5)| \otimes x2$, $x2 \otimes (r7) \longrightarrow |(5\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r5) \longrightarrow |(3\to 4)| \otimes x3$, $x2 \otimes (r567) \longrightarrow |(3\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x3 \otimes (r6) \longrightarrow |(4\to 5)| \otimes x2$, $x3 \otimes (r67) \longrightarrow |(4\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r1234) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 3)| \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r3456) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 5)| \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r123456) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 5)| \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r34) \longrightarrow |(2 \to 3)| \otimes x2$, $x0 \otimes (r1234567) \longrightarrow |(0 \to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r34567) \longrightarrow |(2\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r345) \longrightarrow |(2\to 4)| \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r12345) \longrightarrow |(0\to 4)| \otimes x3$, $x0 \otimes (r12) \longrightarrow |(0\to 2)| \otimes x0$, $x0 \otimes (r1) \longrightarrow |(0\to 1)| \otimes x1$, $x0 \otimes (r123) \longrightarrow |(0\to 3)| \otimes r$, $x0 \otimes (r3) \longrightarrow |(2\to 3)| \otimes r$, $x1 \otimes (r23456) \longrightarrow |(1\to 5)| \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r234) \longrightarrow |(1\to 3)| \otimes x2$, $x1 \otimes (r234567) \longrightarrow |(1\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r4, r7) \longrightarrow |(6\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2345) \longrightarrow |(1\to 4)| \otimes x3$, $x1 \otimes (r2) \longrightarrow |(1\to 2)| \otimes x0$, $x1 \otimes (r23) \longrightarrow |(1\to 3)| \otimes r$, $r \otimes (r4) \longrightarrow 1 \otimes x2$, $r \otimes (r456) \longrightarrow |(3\to 5)| \otimes x2$, $r \otimes (r45) \longrightarrow |(3\to 4)| \otimes x3$, $r \otimes (r4567) \longrightarrow |(3\to 7)| \otimes x3$, $r \otimes () \longrightarrow |(5\to 6)| \otimes x1$.

References

[1] D. Auroux. *Fukaya categories of symmetric products and bordered Heegaard-Floer homology.* J. Gökova Geom. Topol. 4, 2010, 1-54. arXiv:1001.4323

[2] D. Auroux. *Fukaya categories and bordered Heegaard-Floer homology.* Proc. International Congress of Mathematicians (Hyderabad, 2010), Vol. II, Hindustan Book Agency, 2010, 917-941. arXiv:1003.2962

[3] D. Auroux. *A beginner's introduction to Fukaya categories.* In Contact and symplectic topology, vol. 26 of Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud., Budapest, 2014, pp. 85–136. arXiv:1301.7056

[4] D. Auroux, J. E. Grigsby, S. M. Wehrli. *Khovanov-Seidel quiver algebras and bordered Floer homology.* Selecta Math. (N.S.), 20(1):1-55, 2014. arXiv:1107.2841

[5] J. S. Birman, H. M. Hilden. *On the mapping class groups of closed surfaces as covering spaces.* In Advances in the theory of Riemann surfaces (Proc. Conf., Stony Brook, N.Y., 1969), pages 81-115. Ann. of Math. Studies, No. 66. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1971.

[6] A. Cotton-Clay. *Symplectic Floer homology of area-preserving surface symplectomorphisms.* Geom. Topol. 13 (5), 2009, 2619-2674. arXiv:0807.2488
[7] S. Dostoglou, D. A. Salamon. *Self-dual instantons and holomorphic curves.* Ann. of Math. (2) 139, 1994, 581-640.
[8] E. Eftekhary. *Floer homology of certain pseudo-Anosov maps.* J. Symplectic Geom. 2, 2004, 357-375. arXiv:0205029
[9] A. Floer. *Symplectic fixed points and holomorphic spheres.* Comm. Math. Phys. 120, 1989, 575-611.
[10] R. Gautschi. *Floer homology of algebraically finite mapping classes.* J. Symplectic Geom. 1, 2003, 715-765. arXiv:0204032
[11] S. Jabuka, T. Mark. *Heegaard Floer homology of certain mapping tori.* Algebr. Geom. Topol. 4, 2004, 685–719. arXiv:0405314
[12] S. Jabuka, T. Mark. *Heegaard Floer homology of mapping tori II.* In: H. Boden, et al. (Eds.), Geometry and Topology of Manifolds, in: Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 47, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, pp. 119–135. arXiv:0410005
[13] R. Lipshitz, P. Ozsváth, D. Thurston. *Bordered Heegaard Floer homology: invariance and pairing.* Preprint, 2008. arXiv:0810.0687
[14] R. Lipshitz, P. Ozsváth, D. Thurston. *Bimodules in bordered Heegaard Floer homology.* Geometry & Topology 19, 2015, 525-724. arXiv:1003.0598
[15] R. Lipshitz, P. Ozsváth, D. Thurston. *A faithful linear-categorical action of the mapping class group of a surface with boundary.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 15, 2013, no. 4, 1279-1307. arXiv:1012.1032
[16] R. Lipshitz, P. Ozsváth, D. Thurston. *Computing $\widehat{HF}$ by factoring mapping classes.* Geom. Topol., 18 (5), 2547–2681, 2014. arXiv:1010.2550
[17] R. Lipshitz, P. Ozsváth, D. Thurston. *Heegaard Floer homology as morphism spaces.* Quantum Topology, Vol. 2 (4), 2011, 381–449. arXiv:1005.1248
[18] P. Seidel. *The symplectic Floer homology of a Dehn twist.* Math. Res. Lett., 3 (6), 1996, pp. 829-834.
[19] P. Seidel. *Symplectic Floer homology and the mapping class group.* Pacific J. Math. 206, 2002, 219-229. arXiv:0010301
[20] P. Seidel. *Vanishing cycles and mutation.* Proc. 3rd European Congress of Mathematics (Barcelona, 2000), Vol. II, Progr. Math. 202, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001, pp. 65–85, arXiv:0007115
[21] P. Seidel. *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory.* Zurich Lect. in Adv. Math., European Math. Soc., Zürich, 2008.
[22] P. Seidel. *Fukaya A_∞-structures associated to Lefschetz fibrations I.* J. Symplectic Geom., 10:325–388, 2012. arXiv:0912.3932
[23] P. Seidel. *Fukaya A_∞-structures associated to Lefschetz fibrations II.* Preprint, 2014. arXiv:1608.04012
[24] K. Siegel. *A geometric proof of a faithful linear-categorical surface mapping class group action.* Preprint, 2011. arXiv:1108.3676
[25] I. Uljarević. *Floer homology of automorphisms of Liouville domains.* Preprint, 2015. arXiv:1404.2128
[26] R. Zarev. *Bordered Floer homology for sutured manifold.* Preprint, 2009. arXiv:0908.1106
[27] B. Zhan. *Combinatorial proofs in bordered Heegaard Floer homology.* Alg. & Geom. Topology, 16, 2016. arXiv:1405.3004
[28] Python program for computing bimodules. https://github.com/artofkot/computing_bordered

Princeton University
E-mail address: artemk@math.princeton.edu